

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N<sup>o</sup> XLVII. APRIL 1887.

---

ART. I.—CHURCH AUTHORITY.

1. *Francisci Suarez Tractatus de Legibus ac Deo Legislatore.* (Londini, 1679.)
2. *Christian Dogmatics.* By Dr. H. MARTENSEN, Bishop of Seeland, Denmark. English Translation. (Edinburgh, 1886.)
3. *An Essay on the Influence of Authority in matters of Opinion.* By GEORGE CORNEWALL LEWIS, Esq. Second Edition. (London, 1875.)
4. *Macmillan's Magazine.* Vol. LIII. December. (London, 1885.)
5. *Contemporary Review.* September. (London, 1886.)

FOR some few years after the French Revolution of 1848, the eyes and ears of men were frequently confronted with a reiteration of the words, which its authors had adopted as a kind of motto: *Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité*. In our own land, a speaker of eminence, referring to this triple watchword, justly remarked that it certainly could not claim to embrace all the necessary elements of social life. For example, he added, it makes no mention of authority. The course of events in France amply justified this criticism. Within four years after the overthrow of a constitutional monarchy, France sought refuge from the dread of anarchy in the adoption of a despotic government, which endured for the next eighteen years. Clearly, during that period, whatever else she may have kept or lost, France recognized the existence of authority.

And, in truth, authority occupies too large a space in the world of action and the world of thought to be ever, for any lengthened period, discarded from the life of men. Herein

VOL. XXIV.—NO. XLVII.

B

lies our apology for again introducing a subject which, sometimes directly and still more often indirectly, has already been more than once discussed in the pages of this Review.

Assuredly, in offering to our readers a few more reflections concerning authority, we do not undertake our task in any lightness of heart, or without a keen sense of its exceeding difficulty. The difficulty may conceivably lie in the very nature of things, in the limitations inherent in the creature. Every created being, endowed with intelligence, conscience, and will, has been rendered in its measure what Aristotle terms a primary and original source of action.<sup>1</sup> When is it rightfully submitting its action to the will of its Creator, when is it wrongfully trusting too much to its own inherent consciousness of strength? Richard Hooker dies, as Isaak Walton tells us, 'meditating the number and nature of angels, and their blessed obedience and order : ' and yet it is possible that those holy messengers of the Most High may at moments lean too much on their own powers, and commit errors of judgment; and that the words of the patriarch of old become literally correct : ' Behold, He putteth no trust in His servants : and His angels He chargeth with folly.' <sup>2</sup>

But if such danger be imaginable in the case of creatures who have always remained upright, how terribly must it needs be exaggerated when its problems have to be faced by beings who have inherited a fallen nature! In the use of such language we do not, of course, imply acceptance of that extreme Calvinistic tenet, which would represent any part of human nature as in itself substantively evil. But that dislocation and disarrangement of parts (which even the most moderate divines, in the vast majority of Christian communions, recognize as the result of man's alienation from God) must evidently tell with special force, wherever variant principles, good in themselves, have to be reconciled and harmonized in practice. And here, both on the part of rulers and of ruled, of teachers and of taught, how hard is it to combine lawful liberty with rightful sway and due submission. There may be moments in the history of nations, and in the history of individual minds, when stern compulsion is the best thing that can happen to them, moments to which they may look back with gratitude. That

<sup>1</sup> ἀρχὴ τῶν πράξεων. *Eth. Nicomach.* (iii. 3, ed. Grant).

<sup>2</sup> Job iv. 18, *R.V.* The Vulgate and the Septuagint are at least compatible with the *R.V.*; for though the latter employs an aorist (κατὰ δὲ ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ σκολιὸν τι ἐπενόησε), this may be an aorist expressive 'of a repeated, but distinct occurrence' (Donaldson, *Gk. Grammar*, § 427).



is a touching passage in the *Ricordi* of Massimo d'Azeglio, in which he relates how his father imposed upon him at least one night of suffering (and probably many more through the consequent delay) in order that his invalid mother might not know that her son had broken his arm. 'And now that I am old, and have seen the world,' he writes, 'I bless my father's stern firmness; and I would that all Italian children possessed a parent like him, and would profit more by it than I did: within thirty years Italy would be the first of nations.'<sup>1</sup> In like manner, many thousand citizens of a great empire, that of Germany, are at this moment willing to condone the strain placed upon their allegiance by some arbitrary acts of their Emperor and his councillor Prince Bismarck. Perhaps, say they, some of these acts may have been unconstitutional, but still they were needed under the circumstances. '*Salus Reipublicæ suprema lex.*' Similarly, too, looking further back, it is only re-echoing the voice of a chorus of liberal historians—Guizot, Voigt, Arnold, and many more—if we confess that the claims of mediæval Popes to enforce the moral law on tyrannous despots, though often extravagant in form and mode, were, by God's good providence, overruled to the welfare of the rude society of those ages. Wordsworth has sung of that supremacy as 'not utterly unworthy to endure;' a living prelate, certainly not biassed towards its teaching, has expressed a doubt whether such a usurpation may not have been a practical necessity for a portion of the times through which it lasted; and Dr. Arnold, in words of remarkable charity and generosity, has dwelt on the excuses which may be urged even for the overpowering ambitiousness of a Hildebrand and an Innocent III.<sup>2</sup>

Nevertheless the position of the Dictator in the commonwealth of ancient Rome seems to embody a lesson for all who would aspire to such authority. It may be needed, it may prove beneficial; but it is for emergencies only, though these may last longer in some circumstances than in others. Azeglio may have needed it in boyhood, but even there, too, it may be unduly prolonged. One, who will by many be deemed an erratic thinker, but be everywhere recognized as a

<sup>1</sup> *I Miei Ricordi* (Firenze, 1867), vol. i. p. 107.

<sup>2</sup> 'We dare not analyse too closely the motives of our best actions; but if ever grand conceptions of establishing the dominion of good over evil may be allowed to have concealed from the heart the ignobler feelings that may have been mixed with them, this excuse may be justly pleaded for Gregory VII. and Innocent III.' (*Miscellaneous Works*, p. 283).

man of real genius, has lately been proclaiming to the world the mistake of his affectionate parents :—

‘ Lastly, and chief of evils, my judgment of right and wrong and powers of independent action were left entirely undeveloped, because the bridle and blinkers were never taken off me. Children should have their times of being off duty, like soldiers ; and when once the obedience, if required, is certain, the little creature should be very early put for periods of practice in complete command of itself : set on the barebacked horse of its own will, and left to break it by its own strength.’<sup>1</sup>

And as in individual, so, too, in national life. Plato has told us that of all men he will become most miserable who, desiring to be a tyrant, shall have his wishes gratified ; and certainly it may be questioned whether the possession of almost unlimited power has not often proved as unfortunate for the ruler as for the ruled. The first half of the long reign of Louis XIV.—it lasted seventy-two years—was a brilliant series of successes ; the latter half was marked by almost uninterrupted failure. Sismondi and De Carné suggest the same cause. For some five-and-thirty years Louis was served by men trained up in the system of comparative liberty permitted by the sway of his father Louis XIII. ; during the remainder by those who had only known the stringent bondage of his own *régime*. Similarly, too, has it been said concerning the first Napoleon, that his acceptance of a constitution framed by the Abbé Sieyès might have prevented him from achieving some victories which redounded to the glory of France ; but that it would also have saved him from many mistakes, and that he might probably have died upon a throne.

Still more fatal, but more germane to our immediate subject, is the despotism that weighs down all freedom of thought. On this head let it suffice to cite Döllinger’s description of Spain between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries :—

‘ In Spain, where Protestantism has been entirely excluded, theology languished. . . . Night and darkness followed on this, learning perished under the Inquisition, and has not yet revived. . . . Not only was it impossible to write a learned work without coming in contact with the Inquisition, you could not even have possession of the necessary materials. . . . There is nothing to say of Spain. Balmes appeared as a solitary, soon-vanishing meteor, and even his

<sup>1</sup> *Præterita*, by John Ruskin, LL.D., vol. i. chap. 2, p. 64.

writings show very clearly the great deficiency of historical and theological culture in his country.<sup>1</sup>

But it is high time to turn from these illustrations of acknowledged dangers to the more immediate objects of this paper. At the risk of repeating some propositions and arguments which have appeared before, and at no distant date, in the pages of this Review, we desire to dwell principally upon the following topics:—

1. It seems necessary, though this is not at present our primary object, to say something on that latest and most extreme development of the principle of authority, which has not unnaturally been termed 'Vaticanism.'

2. While wishing to allow to freedom of thought its own sphere, we maintain, with Dorner,<sup>2</sup> that all true progress consists in the combination of the fixed with the alterable. We further maintain that those who allow reason with conscience, Holy Scripture, and the consent of Christendom to be concurrent factors in the formation of authority in things spiritual, can hardly help admitting that certain principles advocated by many Fathers of the Church and great Anglican divines have not been yet disproved and overthrown.

3. We desire to call attention to some attempts to lessen what seems to us the proper range and sphere of Church authority; taking one example as a specimen—in some respects a very favourable specimen—of what is, in our judgment, a perilous minimizing of such authority.

(1) Anarchy, let the school of Rousseau say what it will, is a miserable and unnatural state of things. In political life it has again and again led great nations to endure even despotic government as a refuge from its wretchedness. In the realm of thought authority also holds its place; nay, at the risk of seeming paradoxical, we venture to think it probable that its sphere as regards secular knowledge is larger than it was some time ago; say, for example, at the commencement of the seventeenth century.<sup>3</sup> At that time Francis Bacon could speak of himself as having taken all knowledge for his province. In our own day no sane man would presume to make a claim so daring.

Fellows of the Royal Society of London are obliged to

<sup>1</sup> Address delivered at the Munich Congress of 1863.

<sup>2</sup> *Doctrine of the Person of Christ* (Division I., vol. ii. p. 105, *à propos* of Origen. Eng. translation). (Edinburgh: Clark, 1862.)

<sup>3</sup> We think that this impression receives some confirmation, at least indirectly, from the well-known volume of the late Sir George Cornewall Lewis, which we have placed at the head of this article.

confess that they are in danger, like the builders of Babel, of not understanding one another's language. Every physical science has been so prodigiously enlarged that few men can master more than three or four; and the rest they must needs take upon authority. Even in pure mathematics we find *savants* confining their chief, perhaps their almost exclusive, attention to single departments. It must, however, be owned that the reign of authority in many subjects is comparatively brief. The reign of the autocrat only lasts until a stronger than himself appears. We have known a case of a geologist asking a friend if he took interest in geology, and receiving for a reply the announcement that the friend had in his youth attended two courses of lectures by Buckland. In a tone of compassionating contempt, the querist said that Buckland's day was quite gone by. He was himself a tolerably active investigator; yet he, too, still leant on authority, only it was the authority of Sir Charles Lyell.

Such a *régime*, however, it may be said, is not coercive. It is not like that of a society, or a club, which excludes from membership all who do not agree in certain opinions; or of a State, which, like the great American Republic, considers itself bound to persecute a polity, such as that of Mormonism, which erects an *imperium in imperio*, and threatens the subversion of civilized society as it is understood by Christian nations. This is, to a large extent, true. But it has its limitations. Even bodies of scientific men employ a coercive authority in respect of scientific theories which they consider dangerous. We do not know whether Colleges of Physicians would give a diploma to a student who should avow that he intended only to practise homœopathy.

Now a coercive authority in religion over Christendom at large has, as we all know, been formally claimed for the Papacy by the decrees of the Vatican Council held in A.D. 1870.

Cardinal Newman, in the reissue of his *Essays*,<sup>1</sup> speaks of the theory of authority set forth in the volumes of Sir William Palmer as paradoxical. It is not, we trust, unfair to ask in turn whether any paradox in the realm of religious thought and action can be greater than that which he and his co-religionists have adopted, since they submitted to the Vatican decrees.

These decrees involve the acceptance of the following positions. That through the epoch of the four great ecclesiastical

<sup>1</sup> *Essays, Critical and Historical* (London: Pickering, 1871), vol. i. p. 181).

gatherings (A.D. 325 to 451) there existed, unknown to the Church of that period, as well as to the Church of earlier years, an authority which might have saved Christendom the anxiety, the turmoil, the expense, the risk of summoning bishops from all parts of the earth to decide on vital questions of doctrine. That local Councils—such as, *e.g.*, the Second Council of Orange—which discussed important doctrinal questions such as that of Semi-Pelagianism, ought at once to have submitted their decisions to this central authority. That Councils like that of Constance (A.D. 1415), which even in an extreme case ventured to depose a Pope, must be wholly rejected by Roman Catholics. That not only has the entire Gallican school been in error as regards the relations between a Pope and a Council, but that assailants of Roman Catholicism understood it better than some of its most devout and learned defenders.<sup>1</sup>

We can hardly marvel, when we consider how extremes beget extremes, that these paradoxes have alienated from the Roman communion, not only learned men nurtured within its pale—a list to be headed, of course, by Ignatius von Döllinger—but also some of the most brilliant among the youthful converts of 1845, such as Le Page Renouf. Among its English priests one left it, alas! for Socinianism; and a canon, driven into scepticism, is reported to have bequeathed his private fortune to the Hibbert Trustees.

Further (though we sincerely trust that this may prove to be a temporary result of Ultramontanism), it seems to involve a considerable danger for history. Report says that the valuable Encyclopædic Dictionary of Roman Theology, by Drs. Wetzer and Welte, has been seriously altered in its latest German issue; although the process has not yet, we believe, been applied to the French translation by the Abbé Goshler. An Oratorian, the Rev. F. Hutton, published a volume against Anglican Orders, which seemed to us to treat

<sup>1</sup> We subjoin an instance hitherto, we believe, unnoticed. The Rev. Alban Butler, author of a work which not only an historian like Palgrave, but even Gibbon treats with respect, the well-known *Lives of the Saints*, had at one time a controversy with a Mr. Bower, who had left the Church of Rome. Speaking of the infallibility of the Pope, Alban Butler wrote 'that no [Roman] Catholic looks upon it as an article or term of communion. . . . If he (Mr. Bower) had proved that some Popes had erred in faith, he would have no more defeated the article of supremacy than he would disinherit a king by arraigning him of bad policy. But Mr. Bower never found the infallibility of the Pope in our creed, and knows very well that no such article is proposed by the Church or required of anyone.'—Life of Rev. Alban Butler, prefixed to an edition of *Lives of the Saints*, p. xxviii. (edition of 1866; Dublin: James Duffy).

evidence in such a fashion as to tend towards universal distrust of all history.<sup>1</sup> Cardinal Newman, to our real sorrow, condescended to write a commendatory preface to this worthless book. It may have surprised him, but it certainly did not in the least surprise us, to find that within a few years after its publication its author not only left the Oratory, but became an utter sceptic.

Again, Ultramontaniam, as consolidated by the Vatican decrees, has greatly altered the relations between the Roman and the Oriental Churches. The Popes who summoned the Councils of Lyons and of Florence for the reunion of the Greeks (Gregory X. and Eugenius IV.) thoroughly recognized Eastern Christendom as a power with which they could treat as on something like equal terms, speaking in their official documents of 'the union of the Western and Eastern Church,' and of 'uniting the Church of God.'<sup>2</sup> But the Vatican decrees have claimed for the Bishop of Rome, not merely a difference in degree, but in kind over all other Bishops and Patriarchs. It is hard to see how such negotiations as those of Lyons and of Florence can be recommenced in future years.

Nor do the protests from within the pale of the Roman Church die away, as its supporters prophesied that they would. The circumstances connected with the publication of the Abbé Roca's pamphlet, *Le Christ, le Pape et la Démocratie*, may admit of some explanation. But such evidence as at present lies before the world, representing Leo XIII. as silently permitting its publication, looks as if the Pope himself was not wholly averse to warnings against the excesses of Ultramontaniam, or at any rate thought that whatever perils menaced the Roman Church did not lie in the direction of the views set forth by M. Roca.

Another paradox is this. Cardinal Newman (supposed herein to represent the more moderate school of those who have submitted to the Vatican Council) understands that the claim made on behalf of the Pope only extends to cases in which the Bishop of Rome sets forth his decision on questions of faith or morals with solemnities similar to those of a General Council. Now a Roman Catholic, a man of great

<sup>1</sup> An examination of this (now, we suppose, virtually defunct) book will be found in No. 19 of this Review (April 1880, Art. ix.).

<sup>2</sup> See Döllinger's *Lectures on the Reunion of the Churches* (English translation, by Mr. Oxenham. Rivingtons: 1872), lect. vii. p. 153, text, and note of translator; also Ffoulkes's *Christendom's Divisions*, pp. 259-61, 337-40, therein referred to.



and varied learning, assured us that he did not know of any such case, saving and excepting the decree of the late Pope, Pius IX., respecting the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception.

Into the difficulties connected with physical science and Vaticanism we need not enter, because the startling licence claimed by Mr. Mivart has already been discussed in this Review (Jan. 1886). But it may be well to borrow a few sentences from an Italian writer on the widespread tendency of the misfortune which Mr. Ruskin deplotes in his own particular career.

'The excessive use of authority,' says Pomponio Leto, 'in relation to the masses has the result of sometimes weakening and sometimes of suppressing the working of individual consciences, by absorbing their sense of personal responsibility in the sole conscience of Church authority, and so the perception of good and evil ceases to be personal and spontaneous, and becomes reflective and obligatory. It often happens that a [Roman] Catholic, unless gifted with an unusual superiority of mind, has no knowledge of good and evil other than that which he derives from the external authority, which in many cases is represented by any chance individual. Nor is this only with regard to questions of principle, where such help may be sometimes both desirable and salutary, but the same external direction is applied on all occasions, in all contingencies, in the everyday life of the people, and is carried by simple natures into trivial details and matters of no importance.

'The consequence of such an excessive submission to authority is that the human conscience, being often ill-guided, is likely to go astray; at any rate, never having learned to reflect and judge for itself, it loses the capacity for so doing, grows gradually weaker, and at last becomes impotent, just as the members of the body, if never used, lose their strength.'<sup>1</sup>

It is true that much of this is of long duration; but the author maintains, and with apparent reason, that the Vatican decrees intensify the concentration of authority.

Roman Catholics sometimes retaliate in this fashion. They first assert, and not without some show of reason, that the weakness of all the reformed communions, including the Anglican Church, lies in an opposite direction—namely, in a tendency to anarchy; and they add that this evil leads to

<sup>1</sup> *Otto mesi à Roma durante il Concilio Vaticano.* By Pomponio Leto [the Marchese Francesco Vitelleschi]. Chapter headed 'February,' Division III. sec. 9. Not having the original at hand, we quote from the English version (London: Murray, 1876). Fuller details were given in this Review in July, 1878, Vol. vi. p. 279, 'The Dogmatic Position of the Church of England,' which, along with a more recent paper, (April 1883, Vol. xvi. p. 71), 'The Claims of Authority in Matters of Faith,' will be found to supplement the present article.



scandals greater than any exhibited in the Roman communion. The able, and in many respects useful, Dictionary of Messrs. Addis and T. Arnold parades the continuance of Dr. Colenso in his See by the State as a graver scandal than anything that has occurred of late years within the pale of the Roman obedience. Assuredly we are none of us good judges in our own case; but, without denying that the instance alleged was a real scandal, we must own to have been much more shocked by such facts as the following. That at a time when the Roman Curia had full power over the press, and sedulously prohibited the publication of anything even supposed to be seditious within its dominions, the atheistic essays of Leopardi were tolerated. That Achilli, 'who had been charged with shameful crimes such as in Germany would have assigned him to an infamous punishment in a convict prison, was made Professor in the College of Minerva at Rome, and then sent as a preacher to Capua.'<sup>1</sup> That South America, after making all allowance for wild Mexican blood, is, in the parts under Roman Catholic sway, a disgrace to Christendom. Pomponio Leto refers to this scandal, and the youthful Rudolph de Lisle spoke of 'the holy sacrifice' in those regions being 'made a sacrilege'; and of the state of the priesthood being so corrupt that he could not conscientiously go to confession.<sup>2</sup> Lastly, whatever blame may rest upon Irish landlords, or upon the British Parliament, it is admitted, even by many Roman Catholics, that the annals of Ireland during the last five years do afford ground for a most grave indictment against the moral influence and teaching of Rome in that unfortunate country.

(2) In professing especially to address those who regard reason combined with conscience, Holy Scripture and the consent of Christendom, to be concurrent factors in the formation of spiritual authority, we may seem to be narrowing our audience. But we would fain ask any Christian man who is striving 'to contend earnestly for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints,'<sup>3</sup> whether, in the formation of his own convictions, or in the attempt to defend those convictions, he can possibly dispense with any of these three factors. That the proportion of the three elements differs greatly in different cases and in different ages, we willingly admit, but Christianity cannot dispense with any of them.

<sup>1</sup> Döllinger, *The Church and the Churches*, p. 399, English Translation.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoir of Lieutenant Rudolph de Lisle, R.N.*, by Rev. H. N. Oxenham (London, 1886).

<sup>3</sup> St. Jude 3.

A glance at what seems to be their present *status* may render the meaning of subsequent argument somewhat clearer than it would otherwise be.

Both the written Word and the teaching of Christendom appeal to reason and to conscience. 'And why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right? . . . Doth not even nature itself teach you?' 'Say what we will,' wrote the late Charles Marriott, 'men cannot believe that in which they do not in some sense think that they see reason.' 'I express myself with caution,' says Bishop Butler in a well-known passage, 'lest I should be mistaken to vilify reason, which is indeed the only faculty we have wherewith to judge concerning anything, even revelation itself.'<sup>1</sup> And in blending reason with conscience we have, we think, the sanction of Eudemus, of Butler, and of Lacordaire.

Reason and conscience ought to lead men to an acceptance of the truths of natural religion, as the Apostle seems to intimate (Rom. i. 20, ii. 14, 15). And yet it is not to be denied that the human conscience, when enlightened by the Gospel gifts (that is to say, both by revelation and by the gifts of the Holy Spirit), perceives difficulties which would not otherwise have pressed upon it. Difficulties which never occurred to the heathen mind arise in the Christian mind, because a Christian mind is so deeply imbued with a sense of God's mercy, justice, and love; nay, even narratives which did not startle the mind of the Jew do often at first sight startle the soul which has been nurtured in the faith of the Gospel. A foreign apologetic writer who has dwelt upon this topic, M. Nicolas, thinks it probable that we must expect, as time rolls on, rather an increase than a diminution of this form of perplexity.<sup>2</sup>

Now if such hesitation arose simply from a deep contemplation of the Divine attributes of love and mercy as set forth in the teaching of Christ and His Apostles, it might be one-sided; still it would probably receive, on further con-

<sup>1</sup> *Analogy*, Part II. chap. iii. For Eudemus see Lib. VI. of the Ethics usually attributed to Aristotle, cap. xii. (ed. Grant). (Of course, if this book be Aristotle's, the authority is somewhat higher.) For Butler, consult Dissertation at the close of the *Analogy*, 'On the Nature of Virtue':—'Conscience, . . . whether considered as a sentiment of the understanding, or a perception of the heart, or (which seems the truth) as including both.' Lacordaire, in the third of his *Conférences* held at Toulouse, says: '*La conscience est la raison inspirée par l'amour; sacré mariage, au fond du sanctuaire, des deux plus saintes choses entre celles qui ne sont pas Dieu.*'—*Conférences*, tome i. p. 193, ed. Paris: 1861.

<sup>2</sup> *Etudes Philosophiques sur le Christianisme* (septième édition. Paris: Vaton), deuxième partie, chap. viii. 'L'Enfer.'

sideration, its due counterpoise and correction. But too often, we fear, it arises from a painful lack of any deep sense of the hatefulness of sin; from any real conviction that our fallen nature is very likely to come immeasurably short, in this matter, of the standard which God would fain have us strive to attain to, both as regards the corruption cherished in our own hearts and that which we witness around us. M. Guizot, with only too much reason, asserts concerning the generation that lived towards the close of the eighteenth century that it did not hate evil. We are now incurring a like danger. Both men and women of our day who hear the plain warnings of Holy Scripture and God's Church are inclined, with far too much haste and levity, to urge the sacred plea of conscience; forgetting how deeply their own conscience has been stained and enfeebled. And yet a heathen could feel that our power of discernment had itself been dimmed: *id ipsum quod judicat ægrotat*.

Even teachers who have exhibited many good gifts have more or less encouraged the setting up of conscience as a final tribunal. Not only Rousseau and the late Bishop Colenso, but also John Foster, Dr. Cox, Dr. Davidson, and we fear we must add Erskine of Linlathen, have all encouraged this dangerous licence of at once setting our own reason and conscience against the word of God the moment that the two seem to clash.<sup>1</sup> Very different was the tone of such men as Hooker, Robert Hall, Arthur Hallam, and even (in time past) of Francis Newman.

It cannot, however, be said that the claims of conscience have been rudely thrust aside. Difficulties in the Old Testament, such as the case of Abraham preparing to slay Isaac, the acts of Ehud and of Jael, have been again and again considered by scholastic authors (as, *e.g.*, Suarez) as well as by commentators. Within the last few years they have formed the subject of special treatises by English theologians; as, for example, the Boyle Lectures of Archdeacon Hessey on *The Moral Difficulties of the Bible*, and Dr. Mozley's *Ruling Ideas in Early Ages*. We claim, then, for reason and conscience some very real and distinct rights of their own. The Church may teach much that is above reason; it cannot lawfully teach that which is contrary to right reason. If it proclaimed that God is One and God is Three in precisely the same sense, sound reason would compel us to reject such teaching. But when it announces, as the voice of revelation, that God is One in

<sup>1</sup> Examples are given by Prebendary Macdonald in a powerful pamphlet against Universalism (London: Hatchards, 1883).

substance, threefold in Personality; such an utterance may be mysterious, but it no more contravenes reason than similar *dicta* concerning space, or time, or human life. Neither do we question but that conscience may find, and does find, its own difficulties in revelation. Such problems need tenderness on the part of those who attempt to solve, or at least to minimize them for others; deep humility on the part of the inquirers. Lest any should ask for a more detailed description of the mental attitude we would fain cultivate, we subjoin in a note an extract from one of the writers to whom we have referred.<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile there does not seem much danger of the rights of conscience being ignored. Even in quarters usually supposed least accessible to such considerations those rights are conceded. The famous assertion of Bishop Butler that if conscience had power as it has authority it would rule the world, seems always to have retained its hold on the mind of at least one author of our time, who in his earlier days had (morally) sat at that great teacher's feet. Cardinal Newman has told us, in his Letter to the Duke of Norfolk, how, though drinking healths in such a case may not be quite the thing, he is prepared to drink 'to the Pope if you please, but to Conscience first;' and he speaks of its voice as 'that aboriginal Vicar of Christ, a Prophet in its information, a Monarch in its prepotence, a Priest in its blessings and anathemas.'

But when we have assigned to conscience and reason their rights in the formation of religious convictions, if they are to be sound and healthy, we desire to remember how in the case

<sup>1</sup> 'Accustomed to transfer our notions of earthly legislation to the idea of the Divine character, our thoughts readily ascribe remedial punishments to the moral regulation of the universe, but are by no means equally inclined to admit the infliction of absolute ruin as compatible with Supreme Benevolence. *But it is not so easy as we imagine to adjust the deep of creation by measurements of fancy, impelled by passion.* "Omnia exeunt in mysterium" was the maxim of the schoolmen. That tremendous mystery, which involves the nature of evil, may include the irreversible doom of the sinful creature within some dreadful cycle of its ulterior operations. This view is indeed gloomy, and such as the imagination of man, for whom there are ills enough at hand without a gratuitous conjecture of more, will not naturally contemplate. Yet for this very reason perhaps it is a presumption in favour of any scheme pretending to revelation that it contains this awful doctrine.'—Arthur Hallam, *Remains*, pp. 203-4. We cannot but think that Lord Tennyson would have done well to read over his lamented friend's words before he wrote his poem entitled 'Despair.' The comments on that poem by F. Clark in the *Month* (January, February, March, 1882) are of course from a Roman point of view, but will be found well worthy of attention.

of fallen man they are not only liable to special perversion, arising out of individual temperament and sinfulness, but also that even at their best they fail to carry us beyond a certain limit. Natural religion does, indeed, imply a belief in the majesty and omnipotence of God, in the existence of a moral law, in a life to come, and a final judgment of all men; but it speaks with great hesitation respecting the profound and interesting questions: 'Is He a God that will listen to prayer? Is He a God that will pardon sin?' It is one of the many blessings of the revelation of even of the earlier dispensation, that it contains not only a republication of natural religion, but likewise repeated replies of ringing clearness to these queries on the part of humble and sin-stained supplicants: 'O Thou *that hearest prayer*, unto Thee shall all flesh come. . . . Thou wilt cast all their sins into the depths of the sea.'<sup>1</sup> And the Scriptures of the New Covenant (while affording far further revelation concerning the nature of God, the nature of man, and the relations between the two) yet invariably appeal to the teachings of the Old Testament, rightly interpreted, as being, within their own sphere of teaching, a final authority. 'It is written' or 'He hath said' (*γέγραπται—εἶρηκε*) is a decision from which lies no appeal.

The tendency of thought during the last half century has lain in the direction of lessening the authority claimed for Holy Scripture. This result is due to many influences. There has been the unavoidable reaction from a too great reliance on the theory of a rigid verbal inspiration; as also from such hasty and untenable positions as the once famous *dictum* of Chillingworth, 'The Bible, and the Bible only, is the religion of Protestants.' Protests against this last-named maxim have arisen from many quarters. Quakers opposed it from their reliance upon the inspiration of individuals. Kant has told us how Lutheran divines said, 'Draw your conclusions from the source itself, the Bible, whence you may derive it pure and uncontaminated;' 'but' (they added, he continues) 'take care that you do not discover anything in the Bible, except what *we* find there.' His reply was natural enough, 'My good friends, you had better tell us what you do find in the Bible, that we may not search in vain, and be told by you at last, that what we fancied we had found there is our own misinterpretation.'<sup>2</sup> It is possibly a consciousness of this difficulty which has led some Lutherans to insist on binding up with the Bible a copy of the Augsburg Confession

<sup>1</sup> Psalm lxx. 2, Micah vii. 19; cf. Isaiah i. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Streit der Facultäten*. Cited in Wilberforce on The Incarnation.

instead of distributing copies which contain nothing but the translation by Luther. Indeed Bishop Martensen claims for the earlier Lutheranism a position very similar to that of Anglicanism. 'The Lutheran Reformation,' he says, '*in its original form*, took a positive attitude towards both dogmatic and ritual tradition, in so far as it was *æcumenical* tradition—i.e. so far as it bore the mark of no particular Church, being neither Greek, Catholic, nor Roman Catholic, but simply Catholic' (*Christian Dogmatics*, p. 34). And a Scottish Presbyterian, the late Dr. Norman Macleod, went perhaps somewhat further than Anglican divines (even than those who would be considered to belong to the High Church school) when he wrote: 'The living Church is more than the dead Bible, for it is the Bible and something more.'<sup>1</sup>

Rationalism, which would lead to the denial of all authority, has, of course, intensified this tendency. Thus, for instance, Reuss, in his able and candid work upon the Canon, urges strongly the part taken by the Primitive Church in settling the Canon of the New Testament, not merely on the ground of Apostolic authorship (a test which would exclude the Gospels of St. Mark and of St. Luke), but also by the consideration of the orthodoxy of the contents of a given book. This is, of course, a concession to the claim of Church authority made at the cost of the Bible being regarded as its own sole and sufficient witness. Looking in another direction, we see that foreign Protestants, both in France and Germany, seem too often to regard the Holy Scriptures as only so much literature; and, to our sorrow, Dr. Martineau, who at one time appeared to be drawing nearer to the Catholic faith, has now avowed his accession to this fatal doctrine.

Nevertheless, within the last decade we can discern, we think, some signs of a reaction. Bishop Lightfoot has shown how every new discovery, such as that of the epitaph on Abricius, is a fresh 'nail in the coffin' of the theories promulgated by Baur of Tübingen and his disciples. Even the weaknesses—for surely it has its weaknesses—of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* increase the strength of our conviction that such writers as its author, even if they had the will, could never have had the ability to forge a Gospel.

And then, again, what comes out of the comparison with rival Scriptures? A translation of the Apocryphal Gospels was purchased by us for the sum of one shilling: so small is

<sup>1</sup> These words will be found in the biography of Dr. Macleod by his brother (London: Daldy, Isbister, and Co., 1876, vol. i. p. 286). Whether they are quite consistent with all his utterances may perhaps be doubted.



the interest that they excite. They have wrought the same measure of harm to the hallowed fourfold narrative, that would accrue to a splendid diamond ornament by the juxtaposition of a set of paste imitations. So, too, as regards those Oriental books to which some lower degree of inspiration may conceivably have been vouchsafed. Of these the Koran is probably the most striking. Möhler, of all modern theologians, has exhibited the fullest recognition of its merits, declaring that it displays 'an original piety, a touching devotion, and a thoroughly individual religious poetry which cannot possibly be forced or artificial.' But Möhler justly adds that 'its essential purport is derived from the Old and New Testaments.'<sup>1</sup> Of the sacred books of China, 'the Kings,' a convert to Christianity has declared that Europeans can form no idea of the utter deficiency of that true critical spirit, which the Christian faith alone supplies, in countries where the Gospel is unknown. Only with that aid, he adds, only with that bright enlightenment, can the real treasures of the ancient books revered by the Chinese, the Schu-King, and the rest, be perceived.<sup>2</sup>

And what shall be said of those Eastern books of which we owe the knowledge mainly to Professor Max Müller and the University of Oxford? Professor Goldwin Smith cannot, we fear, be claimed by us as an ally. But many of his recent utterances demand our deepest gratitude; and we fancy that he is not far off the mark when he compares some of the crudities and absurdities, which have thus been brought to light, to the results of translation of Gaelic lays as forced on Hector M'Intyre by his uncle, Jonathan Oldbuck.

To the causes which have tended to restore Holy Scripture to what we conceive to be its rightful position must be added whatever of recent *exegesis* has been sound, intelligent, and elevating; whether in the way of direct commentary, or of books of devotion or exhortation. The list of such works would (happily) be long. We can only pause to indicate our meaning by a reference to such names as those of Olshausen, Delitzsch, Stier, Westcott, Sadler, Milligan; to such treatises as that of Dr. Salmon on the books of the New Testament; to such discourses as those of Liddon, Scott-Holland, Bishop Woodford, Eugène Bersier; to devotional works such as the

<sup>1</sup> *Ueber das Verhältniss des Islam zum Evangelium* (ed. Döllinger). Regensburg, 1839.

<sup>2</sup> Windischmann, *Die Philosophie im Fortgang der Weltgeschichte* (Bonn, 1827), erster Theil, pp. 54, 55.



posthumous ones of Dr. Pusey and the *Love of the Atonement* by the late Bishop Milman of Calcutta.

Nevertheless, a great deal has happened within the last generation to render Anglicans (and by no means Anglicans only) deeply conscious of the impossibility of making Holy Scripture its own sole and self-sufficient witness and interpreter. It nowhere settles its own Canon; it nowhere lays down any fixed rule for its own interpretation. And many there are, we believe, who, when confronted with modern theories (such as even some of those of Wellhausen and Kuenen respecting the formation of the Pentateuch and the like), feel with thankfulness, as they recite the Nicene Creed in the Eucharistic Office, how completely its proclamation of solemn and eternal verities towers above such subordinate inquiries, and is unaffected by the way in which they may ultimately be determined.

'We must maintain,' says Döllinger, 'in accordance with the frequently repeated testimony of the Fathers and other writers of the ancient Church, that there is no point of Christian doctrine which is not attested and laid down in the Apostolic writings. The Church cannot and dare not receive any teaching which does not find its justification in the Bible, and is not contained somewhere in the New Testament in a more or less developed form, or at least indicated and implied in premises of which it is the logical sequel, and thus shown to fit into the harmony and organic whole of Christian doctrine.'<sup>1</sup>

At the same time we read in Holy Scripture itself of a concomitant source of authority. Our Lord Himself speaks of a Divine Institution against which the gates of Hades shall not prevail; and the great Apostle who congratulates Timothy on having 'known from earliest infancy the sacred writings which are able to make him wise unto salvation,' has previously told his spiritual son of 'the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of the truth.'<sup>2</sup>

This Church universal has spoken in many ways. Firstly, and most clearly and emphatically, in the Creeds which she has adopted. Secondly, by sacred offices, especially her Liturgies, which embody the well-known principle *Lex orandi, norma credendi*. Thirdly, by her rounds of yearly service, which proclaim afresh, and in a manner perhaps even more

<sup>1</sup> *First Age of the Church*, Book II. chap. i. pp. 152-3. English Translation by Oxenham. London: Allen, 1867.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Dr. Pusey's Sermon on the Rule of Faith. His old friend Cardinal Newman seems to make some concessions on this head in his Letter to Pusey and in a note to the third edition of the *Via Media* (p. 288, note on Lecture XI.).

intelligible to the many than the Creeds themselves, the fundamental verities of the Christian faith. Fourthly, by her practices, or resignation of practices.

And in all these cases (excepting the last), and where an Œcumenical Council has not only spoken, but has been subsequently recognized as formulating the doctrine of Christendom, we still hold that, in the words of Sir William Palmer, 'such a judgment is irrevocable, irreformable, never to be altered.'<sup>1</sup>

This is no new, no modern utterance. It is the teaching of ancient doctors such as Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen; of Anglican divines, as Hammond, Pearson, Bull, and Bramhall. It is implied in the Augsburg Confession, in the *Confessio Gallicana*, and in several cognate symbolic documents, such as the Saxon, Belgic, and Polish Confessions, some of which, like our own Homilies, recognize the fifth and sixth Councils as œcumenical. Of these a specimen or two shall be given in a note.<sup>2</sup> For the rest we refer our readers to Palmer on the

<sup>1</sup> *Treatise on the Church of Christ*, part iv. chap. 4 (3rd edit., London, 1842).

<sup>2</sup> 'Ubi enim ecclesia, ibi Spiritus Dei, et ubi Spiritus Dei, ibi ecclesia et omnis gratia. Spiritus autem veritas.'—S. Irenæus, *Adv. Hæreses*, lib. iii. c. 24.

Origen: [He is claiming the right to comment on the Mosaic law in a spiritual manner.] 'Si vero secundum hanc intelligentiam, quam docet ecclesia, accipitur Dei lex, tunc plane omnes humanas supereminet leges, et vere Dei lex esse crederetur.' *Homil. VII. in Levit.* (tom. ii. p. 226, ed. Ben.).

We have to thank Sir William Palmer for these citations, but have taken care to verify them. Tertullian, before he became a Montanist, is full of similar passages in his *De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*: e.g., in c. xxxviii., the Church is represented as saying: 'Mea est possessio. Quid hic ceteri ad voluntatem vestram seminatis et pascitis? 'Mea est possessio; olim possideo: prior possideo; habeo origines firmas ab ipsis auctoribus, quorum fuit res. Ego sum hæres apostolorum. Sicut caverunt testamento suo, sicut fideicommissum, sicut adjuraverunt, ita teneo.'

Augsburg Confession (as quoted by Palmer, but nowhere quite so explicitly in the copy given by Schaff): 'Non enim aspernamur consensum catholicæ ecclesiæ, nec est animus nobis ullum novum dogma et ignotum sanctæ ecclesiæ invehere in ecclesiam, nec patrocinari impiis aut seditiosis opinionibus volumus, quas ecclesia catholica damnavit.'

Gallican Confession, Sec. VI., after affirming the Catholic doctrine concerning the Holy Trinity: 'Et en cela avouons ce qui a été déterminé par les conciles anciens, et détestons toutes sectes et hérésies qui ont été rejetées par les saints docteurs, comme saint Hilaire, saint Athanase, saint Ambroise et saint Cyrille.' (From Schaff's copy: cited in almost identical form by Palmer.)

Archbishop Bramhall: 'I submit myself and my poor endeavours, first to the judgment of the Catholic (Œcumenical essential Church, which if some of late days have endeavoured to hiss out of the schools as a fancy, I cannot help it. From the beginning it was not so. . . . I do

Church, and to the three volumes on Creeds edited by Dr. Schaff, of New York.

Now Cardinal Newman asserts that 'the Anglican theory . . . considers the historical documents and acts of the first centuries to furnish so luminous, forcible, direct, and detailed an evidence of the contents of the Apostolic *depositum*, as to suffice for answering all questions and settling all disputes which may arise on vital points to the end of time.'<sup>1</sup> This account of the matter strikes us as being a slightly overstated one, and hardly consistent with the passage from Bramhall, which was quoted at the close of the original preface of the *Via Media*. But it does contain, we conceive, thus much of truth, that in the great contest of our own times of Christianity against deism, atheism, and agnosticism, it is mainly on the decisions of the first six centuries that Christians rely. And if we are asked for evidence of this position, we reply, that it is possible to quote *dicta* from critics and apologists, which do not in the least inform us to what communion the writers belong. We set down a few by way of illustration :—

(a) 'The distinction between good and evil, proclaimed by human reason, carries with it the recognition of the five fundamental dogmas of Christianity, the existence of God, the creation, the fall, the restoration, and the judgment.'

(b) 'The Christian religion, that is to say, the redemption of men, by a Godmade man.'

(c) 'What is, in fact, Christianity? What is its fundamental position, the base, the substance of all its doctrines? . . . It is, that in consequence of an original and hereditary enfeeblement, man—every man without distinction—had lost the power of fulfilling and even of knowing his duty, and would consequently perish without a chance of safety, if God had not come in human form to reopen to him the sources of virtue, of pardon, and of life.'

(d) 'He [Robert Browning] holds with a force of personal passion the radical tenet of the Christian faith—faith in Christ as God—a tough, hard, vital faith, that can bear at need hard stress of weather, and hard thought.'

(e) 'To be a Christian in any real sense, you must start from a implicitly and in the preparation of my mind submit myself to the true Catholic Church, the Spouse of Christ, the Mother of Saints, the Pillar of Truth. And seeing my adherence is firmer to the Infallible rule of Faith—that is, the Holy Scriptures interpreted by the Catholic Church,—than to mine own private judgment or opinions, although I should unwittingly fall into an error, yet this cordial submission is an implicit retraction thereof, and I am confident will be so accepted by the Father of Mercies, both from me and all others who seriously and sincerely do seek after peace and truth.'—*Works*, Anglo-Catholic Library.

<sup>1</sup> The *Via Media* (London: Pickering, 1877, third edition), vol. i. p. 288, note to Lecture XI.

dogma of the most tremendous kind, and an undogmatic creed is as senseless as a statue without shape, or a picture without colour.<sup>1</sup>

We are far from denying that the extent of the injury wrought by the fall, the mode of restoration, and the amount of ruin to be inflicted on those unhappy ones who deliberately and of set purpose reject their Creator, are still matters of debate within the pale of Christendom. Yet they are not topics on which there seems to be an increasing degree of divergence. Thus, for example, let us look for a moment at the matter of that infection of nature which is, on all hands, allowed to cling even to the regenerate. The Augsburg Confession calls it actually sin (*peccatum*). The framers of the Anglican Thirty-nine Articles considered this language too strong, and wisely, as we think, modified it by describing this infection as something which the Apostle confesses to have in itself the nature of sin (*peccati in sese rationem habere*). The Tridentine decrees, somewhat further removed from the *Confessio Augustana*, call it the fuel of sin (*fomes peccati*): a metaphorical expression, which is possibly liable to the objection that fuel is a dormant material, which can never set itself alight. But when we find modern Roman Catholics, even of the ultramontane school, affirming that the fall has probably given our nature a wrench in the direction of sensuality,<sup>1</sup> we feel that on this matter—if we had no more serious differences—terms of concordance might easily be arrived at, and we might fairly hope for some similar concession on the part of Lutheran divines.

Of the three Creeds in the English Prayer Book, the Nicene has certainly the highest rank, so far as external authority is concerned. But the value of the (so-called) Apostles' Creed is very great, and it contains, in its present form, that important article concerning the descent of our Lord into Hades, which is not found in the Nicene symbol. The symbolum *Quicumque vult*, whether regarded as an actual Creed (as in the Anglican Articles), or as a hymn on the Creed (which seems to be rather the Roman view), has an intense value of its own on which we cannot now dilate.<sup>2</sup> Martin Luther employs language concerning it which is quite

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, the late Dr. George Ward's *Treatise on Nature and Grace*, especially p. 390.

<sup>2</sup> See Dr. Pusey's wonderful sermon on 'Responsibility of the Intellect in matters of Faith.' Compare also Canon MacColl's small, but valuable essay on the damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed. While we are writing we observe from passing notices some considerable concessions on this subject from the Rev. W. Page Roberts.

as enthusiastic as that of John Keble or Cardinal Newman.<sup>1</sup> And as the admissions of bystanders possess an interest of their own, it seems worth while, in passing, to cite the judgment of one who, despite his intense arrogance and self-sufficiency, must, we suppose, have a real claim to be regarded as a man of genius, the late Thomas Carlyle.

'In speaking of Gibbon's work to me [Mr. J. A. Froude] he made one remark which is worth recording. In earlier years he had spoken contemptuously of the Athanasian controversy, of the Christian world torn in pieces over a diphthong; and he would ring the changes in broad Annandale on the Homœousion and the Homoiousion. *He now told me that he perceived Christianity itself to have been at stake. If the Arians had won, it would have dwindled away into a legend.*'<sup>2</sup>

Though we have not space to dwell upon the Creeds, a word must be spoken concerning some of the most important omissions, because they illustrate other propositions herein laid down. We speak under correction, but we cannot call to mind a single symbolic document, which contains any statement whatever concerning the existence of the Holy Angels or of the Fallen Angels. The Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, the Athanasian, are silent respecting them. Neither the Creed of Pope Pius, nor the English Articles, nor the cognate documents of foreign Protestants, make any reference to them.

But against this silence we have to place not only the fulness of Holy Scripture from the beginning to the end of its Canon, but also the evidence of the offices of worship. Every ancient form of Baptism contained a renunciation of Satan; and the highest act of Christian worship almost invariably, we think, embodied something of our own ancient Eucharistic note of triumph: 'Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify Thy glorious Name.'

The omission in the Creeds came about, we imagine, in this way. They are partly developments of the baptismal formula given by our Lord; partly the outcome of con-

<sup>1</sup> Luther doubts whether 'it is not the most important and glorious document composed since the time of the Apostles.' Quoted by Schaff from Walch's edition of Luther's *Works*, vi. 2315. The Orientals do not object to the *Quicumque vult*, provided that the words 'a Patre et Filio procedens' are understood to mean *παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς* and not *ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς*. The latter phrase would, in their judgment, impugn the doctrine of the *μὴν ἀρχὴ* of the Eternal Father.

<sup>2</sup> *Thomas Carlyle: a History of his Life in London* (London: Longmans, 1884), by J. A. Froude, vol. ii. p. 462.

troversy. The formula does not include the Angels ; and as for controversy, in the earlier ages there never was any controversy concerning them. Among the Jews, the Sadducees stood alone in their denial of angel and spirit ; and, as this denial was combined with a rejection of the Resurrection, they were regarded as (so to speak) out of court in such a discussion. Among Greeks and Romans, so far from there being any difficulty concerning the recognition of intermediate beings, the danger lay in an opposite direction. A man's good genius and his evil genius ; nymphs of wood and of mountain, of lake and sea ; national gods and household gods—all this and more was a part of their tradition. A Christian poet of the fifth century, Prudentius, if we recollect aright, rather twits the heathen with their excesses in this respect. And thus it was, we suspect, that the Creeds came to ignore the very being of the Angels.

Again, the Creeds make no mention of the Holy Eucharist. But that solemn mystery bore witness to itself. It is in fact one of the strongest arguments for the truth of the religion, in which it occupies so marked and important a place. On this topic it must here be enough to refer our readers to the excellent Boyle Lectures of Dr. Maclear,<sup>1</sup> and the brief but independent observations of Professor Salmon.<sup>2</sup>

On the lessons taught by Advent and Lent and Passion-tide ; by Christmas, Easter, and Pentecost, we need not dwell. Enough to remark that, with an authority specially their own, they repeat and enforce the lessons taught by the Holy Eucharist and by the Creeds.

The continuance or discontinuance of practices is a more difficult question. Thus the connexion of the Love-feast (the *Agapé*) with Holy Communion, and its subsequent disappearance, proclaims the right of the Church to adopt a non-essential ceremony ; just as our Lord Himself sanctioned such a right on the part of the Jewish Church by condescending to attend the feast of dedication, which had been instituted by Judas Maccabæus.<sup>3</sup> Yet, again, as the devout Hezekiah broke the brazen serpent when it had been abused and become an object of idolatry, the Christian Church gave up the *Agapé*, when it was found to have proved a cause of scandal instead of promoting piety.

<sup>1</sup> *The Evidential Value of the Holy Eucharist* (London : Macmillan, 1883).

<sup>2</sup> *The Reign of Law ; and Other Sermons* (London : Macmillan, 1873).

<sup>3</sup> St. John x. 22, 23.



More complex and more perplexing is the disuse of administering the Holy Eucharist to infants. It was certainly a widespread, if not a universal practice in the early ages of the Christian Church, and might seem to be demanded by such passages of Scripture as St. John vi. 53. But a sort of instinctive feeling appears to have crept over Christendom, to the effect that there were features of this Sacrament which differentiated it from Holy Baptism, and rendered it desirable that only conscious and intelligent agents should become communicants. He who should in this matter seek to revive the primitive practice would be taking upon himself the office of being a judge of at least all Western Christendom.

An interesting addition to the teaching of Œcumenical Councils may be found in the decisions of scattered local Councils. No General Council, so far as we remember, ever dealt with the question of slavery. But a *consensus* of local resolutions tending to better the state of the slave and of the serf bears touching evidence of the unwearied efforts of the early and the mediæval Church to ameliorate the lot of this down-trodden and unfortunate class.<sup>1</sup>

But we are, however, obliged to allow that this theory involves the admission that after the division of East and West—say, roughly, by the close of the eighth century—this condition of things came to an end; and *formally* Œcumenical decisions ceased to be attainable. We have heard this admission stated as a difficulty by a deposed Presbyterian minister of great ability, who always remained in an isolated position; and in the article on the Church in the latest edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* it is said to have been allowed to be a difficulty in one of the reprinted Essays of Mr. Gladstone.

We are far from denying that it is a difficulty. And yet we would fain ask whether it is not only a portion of a still more perplexing problem—namely, why it is that the Eternal Father has not suffered the prayer of His Son (who in His human nature is Head of the Church) to be heard as regards the one-ness of the disciples; why the glowing pictures of

<sup>1</sup> Samples of such Canons of Councils will be found in the work of Balmez on the comparative effects of the Roman Catholic and Protestant communions on civilization. It is an imperfect and one-sided book as regards everything connected with the Reformation; but the claims made for the mediæval Church are not unfounded. With this book may be compared the *Gesta Christi* of an American author, Mr. E. L. Brace (Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1882). Mr. Brace is occasionally almost as one-sided as Balmez, though in an opposite direction.



Christ's Kingdom on earth, foretold by the prophets, seem to have been so faintly realised in history?<sup>1</sup>

The later disruption of Christendom in the sixteenth century, in many respects so necessary, so seemingly inevitable, so fruitful of benefits both to adherents and to opponents, had, of course, its lamentable side. 'That necessary evil—the Reformation,' says Coleridge. And from an opposite quarter have come words whose genuineness has never been denied: 'We know,' said Pope Urban VIII., 'that we may declare Protestants excommunicate, as Pius V. declared Queen Elizabeth, and before him Clement VII. the King of England, Henry VIII.—but with what success? The whole world can tell: we yet bewail it in tears of blood. Wisdom doth not teach us to imitate Pius V. or Clement VII.'<sup>2</sup>

Since that time the decisions of Churches can only be binding over their own members. If in the Anglican Articles the words 'the Church hath authority, &c.' are understood to refer only to that portion of the Church which framed those Articles, we are quite prepared to concede what appears to us this unavoidable limitation. In this matter the Lutherans hold with us; and so do also the Greek and the Russian Churches.<sup>3</sup>

The concurrence of severed communities in certain fundamental principles does, by every law of evidence, strengthen the case on behalf of that wherein they agree. Hence, in part, the force of such statements as those cited by us a few pages earlier:<sup>4</sup> and this may possibly be one reason why the Almighty permits the divisions to continue. The separated communities ought to pray for one another, not the less so because it may be that no one of them is at present sufficiently pure to stand by itself without the correction of rivalry. English Churchmen may learn how to perform this duty by a reference to the devotions of Bishop Andrewes. Meanwhile, we would respectfully submit to our readers a few further considerations.

<sup>1</sup> St. John xvii. 20-23; Isaiah liv. 11-17, with numerous parallel passages.

<sup>2</sup> Ffoulkes, *Christendom's Divisions*, p. 230 (London: Longmans, 1865). The authenticity of this speech seems to be granted by Cardinal Newman in his Letter to the Duke of Norfolk.

<sup>3</sup> See Döllinger, *The Reunion of the Churches*, pp. 150-1. (Eng. Translation by Oxenham.) London: Rivingtons, 1872.

<sup>4</sup> These passages are taken from the writings of (a) the Dominican Lacordaire; (b) M. Chas. de Rémusat, a philosophic critic; (c) the present Duc de Broglie, in his reply to the deist M. Jules Simon; (d) Mr. Swinburne, an unbeliever; (e) Mr. Leslie Stephen, an agnostic.

Döllinger, in language resembling that of Sir William Palmer, has declared of the Church universal, that never can 'a truth once thoroughly acknowledged and believed in the Church be lost, or sink from the dignity of an article of faith to a mere tolerated opinion.'<sup>1</sup> But this maxim, as has already been implied, does not hold good with reference to the rulings of the severed communities. Still, whenever we find an opinion or a practice to obtain among widely-differing communions, such agreement must demand respect; and a willingness to reconsider our own position, if it chance to differ from both. With sincerest diffidence we venture to set down a few examples, by way of illustrating our meaning.

There seems a disposition, *for apologetic purposes*, not to demand from opponents of revelation an acceptance of all the miracles recorded in the Old Testament as being an essential and necessary portion of the deposit of faith. Now, a non-miraculous Christianity is no Christianity at all. As M. de Broglie well puts it: 'The Gospel begins with the birth of a Virgin's Son, and ends with the resurrection from the dead.'<sup>2</sup> But a critic seems to suggest the possibility of a query from a sceptic desirous to believe: 'Am I bound to believe that an iron axe-head has floated?' Speaking merely for himself the present writer would reply, 'For myself, I believe it. The Gospel refers to a far more wondrous miracle performed through the ministry of Elisha: the healing of the leprosy in the case of Naaman the Syrian. Even on physical grounds we have now no right to assert that a metal cannot float. A century ago it seemed a valid induction; but Sir Humphry Davy discovered potassium, and it is found to be a metal specifically lighter than water. Why may not the Creator of matter, of the ultimate constitution of which we are all of us wondrously ignorant, have willed that on a given day iron should in this respect resemble potassium? If you tell me that the occasion was too slight for a miracle, I must reply that we are but poor judges of such a question. Possibly the failure of wine at a wedding banquet might have seemed to us beneath the need of supernatural interference. But that is not the light in which it appears in the Gospel of St. John. Still, as the Church requires only the Apostles' Creed as a condition of Baptism, and the Nicene Creed as a condition of receiving Holy Communion, I do not take upon myself to decide a matter which has not been ruled.' The latter part

<sup>1</sup> *The Church and the Churches.*

<sup>2</sup> *L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain au Quatrième Siècle*, tome i., éclaircissement A. Paris: Didier, 1856.

of such a reply appears to be sanctioned by the Bampton Lectures of Bishop Temple<sup>1</sup> and the language of a deceased Roman Catholic prelate, Bishop Geddes.<sup>2</sup>

Somewhat similar language, though possibly less guarded, might, we imagine, be applied to one who should claim the right to regard the narrative of the Fall, as being, in part perhaps, mythical and allegorical, although embodying a deep and most essential truth.<sup>3</sup> So many divines, from Origen and Augustine down to our own Bishop Horsley, have thought such a view permissible, that even those, who with Hengstenberg prefer a literal interpretation, might hardly be prepared to deny this liberty. The doctrine itself is stamped on man's history and conscience.

‘The candid incline to surmise of late  
That the Christian faith may be false, I find,  
I still, to suppose it true, for my part  
See reasons and reasons; this to begin:  
’Tis the faith that launched pointblank her dart  
At the head of a lie—taught Original Sin,  
The corruption of Man’s Heart.’<sup>4</sup>

Again, the reaction from the coarse teaching of Tetzels led men not only to reject the Roman teaching concerning Purgatory, but likewise all idea of education of the soul in Hades: nay (as may be seen in the Westminster Confession), to deny the very notion of an intermediate state. The counter reaction has become complicated by a tendency (to say the least) towards Universalism, and towards the suggestion of a fresh probation after death. Still, without being prepared to acquiesce in all the positions taken up by Dean Plumptre, and still less in those of Mr. Heard or Mr. George Macdonald, we can fully understand the desirableness of thoughtful and prayerful reconsideration of this profound and mysterious pro-

<sup>1</sup> Lect. VII., pp. 206, 207.

<sup>2</sup> Cited in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, art. ‘Moses.’ We do not commit ourselves to this Bishop's language.

<sup>3</sup> We hear on good authority, that the Jesuits in Germany are convinced that the commentary of *Cornelius à Lapide* is not suited to the needs of the present day; and that they are preparing a new one, which is intended to take its place. They propose, however, to begin their task with the comparatively easy books of Kings and Chronicles, reserving the difficulties of Genesis until a later date. On mentioning this information to a dignitary of the Church, he remarked that the editors of the Cambridge Commentaries on single books of the Bible had displayed a similar reserve.

<sup>4</sup> Robert Browning, ‘Gold Hair: a Legend of Pornic,’ in *Dramatis Personæ*.

blem. There is, surely, both force and beauty in the suggestion, made by more than one modern divine, that in all probability Moses and Elias had imbibed draughts of hallowed truth in the interval between the time when they left this lower earth, and the day whereon they stood upon the Mount of Transfiguration, and discoursed with their Lord 'concerning His exodus which He should accomplish at Jerusalem.'

Once more, individual Churches must watch and be on their guard against the growth of accretions. If, as we believe, a dogma is rightly defined as 'a fundamental principle of saving truth, expressed or implied in Holy Scripture, taught by the Church universal, and consonant to sound reason,' then the danger of erecting into dogmas what are only, at their best, pious opinions and theories, is a very real and serious one. For example, forty years ago the view propounded by St. Anselm, and elaborated by Aquinas, respecting the *mode* in which our Lord's Atonement wrought man's salvation was so fully accepted among us, that even to question it in the slightest degree sounded to many ears like inchoate heresy. That theory may have more to say for itself than some would at present be inclined to allow. But it is not exhaustive; it is not *de fide*; and the renewal of the (perfectly lawful, if unproven) Scotist view of the Incarnation has strengthened the case of those who decline to be bound to it. It is remarkable, *en passant*, to observe the freedom on this head allowed by the terms of the Nicene Creed, and the cautious observations of Bishop Butler.<sup>1</sup>

One example only shall be taken from practice. In accordance probably with the very earliest Christian habits, the Church of England has discouraged non-communicating attendance at the celebration of the Holy Mysteries. Yet it should be remembered, we think, what lives those earliest communicants were living, and how at any moment the cry of *Christianos ad leones* might render a proffered Eucharist their last. Some change in this matter seems to have begun by the Nicene epoch, probably earlier. And now what do we find? On one side of us stand English Dissenters and Scottish Presbyterians; on the other side the Roman Catholics—and all of them allow non-communicating attendance. As a matter of fact, too, which bears upon the practical working

<sup>1</sup> *Analogy*, part ii. chap. v. 'How and in what particular way it had this efficacy . . . I do not find that the Scripture has explained. We seem to be very much in the dark concerning the manner in which the ancients understood atonement to be made; *i.e.* pardon to be obtained by sacrifices.'

and result of our stiffness in this matter, the proportion of communicants to attendants seems to be smaller in the English Church than in any other Christian communion. *Pace Archiepiscopi Durovernenensis*, and with unfeigned respect alike for his Grace's character and office, we cannot but incline to think, with the Dean of Manchester, that this is a subject which requires reconsideration. We imagine that it may prove desirable, on further examination, frankly to permit non-communicating attendance; though we do not wish to forget that one of the best and greatest of Roman Catholics, Möhler, seems to have thought that undue encouragement of this practice tended to tepidity; and that Fénelon went so far as to regard weekly reception by the laity as the ideal of Christian worship. It would also be interesting to consider whether an essayist might not find a fruitful subject for comment under some such heading as 'The Literature of Authority.' His essay would involve references not only to Holy Scripture but also to the books regarded as sacred in the East: possibly it ought to touch upon works devoted to jurisprudence, and certainly it should discuss such books as Plato on *Laws*, which, though not the most artistic, is perhaps the most morally heightened of all the writings of that wondrous man. It should certainly dwell on the treatise of Suarez, to which we have been compelled to make only a passing reference; for although this versatile Spanish Jesuit seems, to our sorrow, sadly materialistic on the solemn subject of the Holy Eucharist, he is in other respects a profound thinker; and this, his greatest work, has won admiration from Grotius, Mackintosh, and Hallam, and from a living Professor of International Law, who told us that he hardly knew any work bearing on the duties of his chair from which he had gained more than from the *De Legibus* of Francis Suarez. All these reflections need a supplementary dissertation upon Church government and the *Ecclesia docens*. But we cannot now undertake these tasks, and are compelled to pass onward to another aspect of the question of Church Authority.

We have thus far, we conceive, been only engaged in stating principles, which in their essence, as distinguished from details of application, have been handed down to us from Patristic, from Anglican, and from (post-Reformation) Continental sources. Our list of names might easily be extended by the addition of Fathers, such as St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and St. Ambrose; of Anglicans, as Field and Saywell; and of Continental foreign reformers as, for instance,

Melanchthon. Further, we believe these principles to have been restated in recent debates of the Convocation of Canterbury; and we find them, to our great satisfaction, embodied in occasional publications of the day composed by men occupying positions of responsibility.

But a very different view of the meaning and limit of Church authority has been recently set forth by one of our clergy who also occupies a position of responsibility, the Rev. J. M. Wilson, the Head Master of Clifton College. The writer's name is a guarantee for high ability in the execution of any task which he undertakes; but we feel bound to add that his brief essay on the subject displays not only ability, but also a lively sympathy with all that tends to purity and holiness, and an earnest desire to be fair. Our readers will find the paper in *Macmillan's Magazine* for November, 1885 (vol. liii. p. 116). They will do well to combine with it another essay from the same gifted pen in the *Contemporary Review* for September, 1886. This later essay is one with which we have much more sympathy; but it is the former on which we now principally dwell, simply because it comes directly across the line of country which we have been attempting to traverse.

Let us, in the first place, mention some leading positions on which, so far as they reach, there is a fair measure of agreement between Mr. Wilson and ourselves.

We entirely agree with him in recognizing the value of certain forms of authority which rightfully claim our intellectual respect, or our spiritual respect, but which still do not demand obedience. The scholarship of a Lightfoot, to take an illustration of his own, has, in Mr. Wilson's words, 'a preponderant weight;' such as we rightfully ascribe 'to the learning and judgment of men whose veracity and impartiality we trust.' Again, the spiritual insight evinced in Scupoli's 'Spiritual Combat,' or in Bishop Jeremy Taylor's 'Holy Living,' may justly win our respect and love; but they do not prove the correctness of all Scupoli's theology, nor the wisdom of all Taylor's decisions in his *Ductor Dubitantium*.

Again, we are not disposed to deny the existence of a certain amount of ambiguity in the language of our Twentieth Article. We incline to believe that by 'the Church' was meant, in its statements, the Church Universal; but we have not at hand the Wurtemberg Confession from which the phraseology was borrowed, and must refrain from speaking positively. Meanwhile, we admit that English divines (as, e.g., Burnet and others) restrict it to the national Church, and



thence argue (logically enough) that the authority is restricted to its own members. With Mr. Wilson we also think that every religious communion must possess the power which is granted to any lawful club or brotherhood—namely, the right of admitting and excluding members; or, in his language, an ‘authority declaratory of the terms of membership.’

Further, we would fain trust that he is right in his hopeful statement, that ‘there exists a diffused and daily growing illumination in a Christian society; on the whole, the verdict of a Christian community is not far wrong—what they bind or loose on earth is bound or loosed in heaven’; and that ‘even on questions of criticism and doctrine within certain limits, *securus judicat orbis*.’

But Mr. Wilson is utterly against us on some principles connected alike with the past and with the future, and also as regards the extent to which some of these past decisions reach.

For example, he will not allow that the decisions even of a Council held before the great schism and recognised as Œcumenical by a subsequent Council were a real focussing of spiritual truth. And, with the frankness that marks his paper, he will not content himself with vague statements. He feels the force of the saying *dolus latet in generalibus*; and accordingly he writes as follows:—

‘If anyone thinks that it was possible once and is impossible now, let him read Church history in some detail, let him read the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon.’<sup>1</sup>

Now this is a fair and open challenge. But to meet it would require a separate article, and such an article we do not altogether despair of some day setting before our readers, though we cannot pledge ourselves to such a course. Meanwhile we make the following reflections.

There is no more common intellectual mistake, than the conviction that certain facts or documents will produce upon the minds of others the same conclusions as those which we ourselves have deduced from them. The value of legal training as a general mental discipline has been much disputed; and some may be inclined, with Coleridge, to speak of such studies as agencies ‘which sharpen, but which, like a grindstone, too often narrow while they sharpen.’ But, however this may be, from the fault which we have just indicated, lawyers are, in general, most commendably free. From their intercourse with clients, from their experience in courts of justice, they see how differently evidence is viewed by diverse

<sup>1</sup> *Macmillan's Magazine*, vol. liii. p. 118.



minds. It is one of the many merits of the Waverley Novels that their author's legal training rendered him keen in the perception of this feature of life. Edward Waverley, being examined before Major Melville, is convinced that some letters from home will tend to dispel the suspicions of his interrogator. 'Major Melville accordingly perused the letters, but the inferences he drew from them were different from what Waverley expected.' Mr. Morton, the kind-hearted parish minister, may take a different view, but the soldier adopts the stern and unfavourable one. So, again, in *St. Ronan's Well*, the *soi-disant* Lord Etherington perhaps persuades himself, and certainly tries to persuade his friend, Captain Jekyl, that he is not malignantly disposed towards his half-brother, Francis Tyrrel. But his attempt is a failure. 'Without a jest, Etherington,' writes Jekyl in reply, 'you must be ruled by counsel in this matter. I detect your hatred to this man in every line of your letter, even when you write with the greatest coolness; even where there is an affectation of gaiety, I read your sentiments on this subject.'

Now, we have no wish on our part to forget the lesson thus suggested. The history of the Council of Chalcedon does possess some difficulties of its own; and it is by no means certain that a narrative from our pen would produce on other minds the effect that a study of its Acts produces on our own. But is not Mr. Wilson slightly in haste? He appears to be absolutely convinced that there can be but one result of such a study as he has recommended. 'Let him read the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon.' Twelve lines comprise the whole of our author's statement on the subject. And so prone are assailants of authority to repose beneath the shadow of authority, that in all probability some ninety per cent. of the readers of Mr. Wilson's paper will say: 'Well, here is the decision of an earnest man, a man of character, ability, and learning. We have not the leisure nor the aptitude for such a study as he proposes. Enough for us to accept the verdict thus pronounced.' For our part we would fain beseech at least the remaining ten to wait. In time they may affect even the large majority that is against them.

We turn to another of Mr. Wilson's statements.

'The Copernican theory, the Darwinian theory, the Straussian theory, most of our disputed questions, are questions as to matters of fact. Now the result of the last four hundred years of growth of the human mind is that we now at last know that matters of fact are not decided by authority.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Ubi supra*, p. 117.

We are sorry to say that, to our thinking, this statement is simply one mass of confusion. Of the creative wisdom that framed the universe Ovid has sung, in well-known words :—

‘Dissociata locis concordi pace ligavit.’

Mr. Wilson has certainly brought together in a single sentence things widely dissevered in space and time. But we cannot allow that he has linked them together in harmonious peace; and, accordingly, we feel compelled to treat them separately.

In the first place, we are inclined to go with him in respect of the Copernican theory. Supported as that theory has been by the wonderful discoveries of Kepler, Newton, and Laplace, it may fairly claim to be accepted as having entered within the very confines of the region of fact. With Pascal we hold that this was a case in which the authorities of the southern Church mistook their province and made a mistake.<sup>1</sup>

But the words, ‘the Darwinian theory’—how much do they mean? A man who says, ‘I am a Darwinian,’ may mean one of two very different things. He may mean: ‘I believe that the Creator of the universe has, to a large extent, arranged Creation by the method of development and natural selection.’ He may also mean: ‘I believe, with Darwin’s supporter, Haeckel, that nature has developed and arranged itself by its own inherent forces, and that this theory dispenses with the need of a Creator, and is in itself a valid proof of Atheism.’

Darwin himself allowed the perfect tenableness of his views with a real Theism; and undoubtedly many sincere Theists are, more or less pronouncedly, Darwinians. For himself, he was an agnostic; but at moments, as he told the Duke of Argyll, the idea that the contrivances of nature were ‘the effect and expression of Mind, came over him *with overwhelming force*.’<sup>2</sup> Unhappily, as we think, Darwin’s practice in his later years seems to have been mainly on the negative side. He absented himself from all public worship, though, we would fain hope, not from private prayer. Yet we are not surprised to find that the words which followed those just quoted were, ‘But at other times it seems to go away.’

‘The Darwinian theory,’ writes Mr. Wilson, ‘is a question of fact.’ He does not, we presume, mean to imply that it is an ascertained fact. Even if Professor Huxley should assert

<sup>1</sup> *Lettres Provinciales*, Lettre xviii.

<sup>2</sup> ‘What is a Science?’ the subject of a Lecture delivered in Glasgow (*Good Words* for 1885, p. 236).

it to be so, Professor Virchow, quite as high an authority, emphatically denies it; and we ourselves are personally acquainted with men of science who think Virchow perfectly in the right, who declare that Darwinism is only an hypothesis, and, moreover, one which has not been proved, and which, in all human probability, never will or can be proved. Still, undoubtedly, so long as Darwinism does not mean more than Darwin himself intended by it, it is simply a question for scientific men, and Church authority can have no conflict with it.

But 'I have seen some letters,' says the Duke of Argyll, 'published in scientific journals, from which it was quite obvious that the writers rejoiced in Darwin simply because they thought that Darwin had dispensed with God, and that he had discovered some process entirely independent of Design, which eliminated altogether the idea of a personal Creator of the universe.'<sup>1</sup>

Against such ultra-Darwinism 'the Holy Church throughout the world' protests by her creeds, by her worship, by her warnings, by the whole framework of her spiritual life. This is a question of Church authority, though not of that authority alone. He who rejects the Church's voice in this matter, as well as that of the Written Word, and also the voice within, must do so at the peril of his immortal soul.

We pass on to the Straussian hypothesis. No two editions of the too famous *Leben Jesu* are identical. Strauss was constantly making changes; withdrawing this and amplifying that. The alterations seem often to have been important ones.<sup>2</sup> Thus, if we mistake not, earlier editions left it an open question whether there had, or had not, lived on earth an actual man, around whom the (alleged) mythic doctrines clustered; while the later ones inclined towards the concession that there had been such a man. But, at any rate, we are to understand that 'it is Humanity and not an individual man that dies and is buried, rises again and ascends to heaven.' We are not going to argue against the Straussian hypothesis. In France, a rationalistic writer, M. Réville, calls it *une tentative manquée*. In Germany, Ewald, in his bewildering and misty biography of our Lord, regarded

<sup>1</sup> Duke of Argyll, *ubi supra*. His Grace adds, 'Now, it so happens that I have some means of knowing that this was not the attitude of Mr. Darwin's own mind.'

<sup>2</sup> We find that Dean Milman was perplexed from the same cause (*History of Christianity*, Preface to New Edition; London: Murray, 1883).

the views of Strauss as so completely gone by, that he did not consider it worth while to mention the book, or even its author's name: and no attack, however keen, seems to have annoyed Strauss so deeply as this silence.

But when we are gravely told that the Straussian hypothesis has nothing to do with Church authority, it really seems to us—we wish to say it with all courtesy and respect—that he who thus addresses us must be dreaming.

Ages before Strauss was born—as it will be in the ages to come now that he has passed away—the Church made in a hundred ways her emphatic protest against his rationalism. He who recites aloud *ex animo* the words of the Nicene Creed—to take one sample of such protests out of many—does in fact proclaim before God and man that the theory of Strauss is a lie. The decision of Nice on the relation of the Son to the Father 'has been unanimously received,' says Gibbon, 'as a fundamental article of the Christian faith by the consent of the Greek, the Latin, the Oriental, and the Protestant Churches.'<sup>1</sup> How, then, can the assertion of Strauss that the religion of Christ is purely mythical be considered by Christian men and women as a question that is removed from the sphere of Church authority? It is no case of antinomies, which may be reconciled for us in another world, though seemingly irreconcilable in this. No! on this head, we as Christians most thoroughly realize the force and truth of the appeal which Mr. Leslie Stephen makes to Christians:—

The essence of the belief is the belief in the divinity of Christ. Accept that belief; think for a moment of all that it implies; and you must admit that your Christianity becomes dogmatic in the highest degree. . . . You are bound to assume that every religion which does not take this dogma into account is without true vital force. Unsectarian Christianity consists in shirking the difficulty without meeting it, and trying hard to believe that the passion can survive without its essential basis. It proclaims the love of Christ as our motive, while it declines to make up its mind whether Christ was God or man, or endeavours to escape a categorical answer under a cloud of unsubstantial rhetoric. But the difference between man and God is infinite; and no effusion of superlatives will disguise the plain fact from honest minds. To be a Christian in any real sense, you must start from a dogma of the most tremendous kind, and an undogmatic creed is as senseless as a statue without shape, or a picture without colour. Unsectarian means unchristian.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Decline and Fall*, chap. xxi.

<sup>2</sup> *Essays on Free Thinking and Plain Speaking*, pp. 123-4. (London: Longmans, 1873.) We need hardly, we think, apologize for re-quoting some words already cited apart from their context.

<sup>1</sup> *Le*  
(Paris:

Now, if we had only Mr. Wilson's second paper before us, we might almost hope that he, in common with ourselves, would accept these vigorous and emphatic words. In that paper he professes, we doubt not in all sincerity, to regard the mystery of the Holy Incarnation as an essential portion of the Christian faith.

But in the earlier essay he distinctly asserts that 'authority to ascertain dogma—there is none and has been none.' Any dogma, if we understand him aright, may cease to be so. Are we to understand that what is an essential part of the Christian faith in the nineteenth century may cease to be such in the twentieth or twenty-first century? If so what right have we to proclaim it in creeds, or to make it a condition of membership? But if it be not so, then we for our part cannot but regard the proclamation of a true Theism and of the essence of Christianity as having been acts that stamped the decisions concerning them as bearing the impress of a real and hallowed and undying authority while the world shall last.

The Duc de Broglie in his graphic sketch of the first great general Council reminds his readers how replete with polytheistic legends was the soil and neighbourhood of that land wherein the Creed of Nicæa was first proclaimed. Homeric tale had there made its home; and each island bordering on the coast boasted of enjoying the protection of some special god, and of being the birth-place of some heathen sage. Samos had its temple of Neptune, and its cradle of Pythagoras; Apollo of Claros and the Diana of the Ephesians were at hand; there, too, had taught Thales and Anaximander; there also had Heracleitus been born; and there the Corybantes celebrated the wild ritual of 'the great mother,' Cybele. They have passed away, those far-famed objects of adoration. But the Creed which some three hundred men there drew up is still, after the lapse of more than fifteen hundred years (in a form enlarged indeed, but not substantially changed) weekly chanted at 10,000 altars.<sup>1</sup> Is its spell of power waxing faint in Christendom? We answer in the words of a modern author.

'Not one of those schemes of biblical belief, which in the lapse of time has disputed the ground with the Nicene faith, recommends itself by that charm of interior congruity which this latter so conspicuously possesses. It is this alone that is an entire Belief, and concerning which it may be affirmed that its elements—abstract,

<sup>1</sup> *L'Eglise et l'Empire Romain au Quatrième Siècle*, tome ii. p. 68. (Paris: Didier, 1856.)

moral, and spiritual—are in unison. In this Belief there is proportion and symmetry and that grandeur and simplicity which is the inimitable characteristic of a Great Truth in any department. With this Belief at my heart, the logical ground of the historic evidences is firm to the foot; without it, while attempting to give coherence to the body of proof, I tread a shifting sandbank.

'Yes,' it may be said, 'this is the sort of language we expect to hear from Roman Catholics like M. de Broglie or Anglicans of the school of Hooker or Bramhall.' Possibly: but as a plain matter of fact this extract (which, had we space to quote it at length, would be found much more enthusiastic in its eulogy) proceeded from the pen of a distinguished Nonconformist, the late lamented Isaac Taylor.<sup>1</sup>

And now we find ourselves asked to believe that the body which accomplished this wonderful triumph of enunciation in things divine had 'no authority to ascertain dogma.' Verily, he who invites us to believe this, is asking us to believe a great deal!

We may indeed be told that our teaching is of an antiquated cast: that neither English dissenters nor continental Protestants now proclaim aloud the weighty words, with which the Augsburg confession opens: 'The churches, with thorough harmony amongst us (*magno consensu apud nos*) teach that the decree of the Nicene Synod concerning the unity of the divine Essence and of the Three Persons is true, and without any doubt to be believed (*verum et sine ullâ dubitatione credendum esse*).' We reply that so long as such writers as M. Bersier and Bishop Martensen and Dr. Dorner flourish, we cannot regard the principles here defended as having wholly passed away from the theology of continental Protestantism; and that wherever they are denied, their surrender involves the surrender of a great deal more besides. Mr. Spurgeon in one of his sermons preached last year deplores the amount of scepticism prevalent among teachers of religion throughout the land, expressly adding that he is not, in thus speaking, thinking of the Church of England; and Mr. Matthew Arnold, though from an utterly different point of view, has employed expressions of a similar tendency.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Restoration of Belief* (Part III.), London, 1853. The reader will do well, we think, to compare a paper which appeared in *Macmillan's Magazine* for January 1886, entitled, 'The King's Daughter in Danger' (vol. liii. pp. 193-204), which has hardly received the attention due to its merits.

<sup>2</sup> 'Its [Roman Catholic] real superiority is in its charm for the imagination—its poetry. I persist in thinking that Catholicism has from this superiority a great future before it; that it will endure while all the Protestant sects (amongst which I do not include the Church of England)



With one thought we must now conclude. There are those in all civilized lands who are repudiating alike the authority of Conscience, of Scripture, and of the Church. Is it possible that the action of unbelief, which has already powerfully influenced Christendom, may be permitted to bring together, in ways we cannot foresee, those who do revere some spiritual authority? A thoughtful writer in *Fraser's Magazine*, some eight years since, asserted that such a result must inevitably come to pass; and though his language sounds to us too confident and sanguine, we willingly quote it as something well worthy of our best consideration. After stating his conviction that the Christendom of the future will be ranged into two (possibly final) divisions, the party of Authority and that of Free Inquiry and Criticism, the writer proceeds:—

‘Little as either party may be inclined to acknowledge it, it is yet certain that the difference between those who build their faith on an infallible and unquestionable authority, whether that authority be a man, or a Church, or a book, is in principle insignificant, when compared with the difference between any religion of authority and the religion based on scientific inquiry.’

Then, after declining to speculate on the form which such reconciliation may take, he adds:—

‘It is enough to indicate our belief that of the parties which now divide the Church, two are more likely to be more and more drawn together in defence of old tradition against modern thought; and that the High Church and Low Church (retaining no doubt for a long time much of their separate individuality) will more and more coalesce into a single army against that Liberal movement, which, as Dr. Newman foresaw more than forty years ago, is the dividing principle of the present and the coming age.’<sup>1</sup>

Meanwhile, with Archbishop Bramhall, we must trust to the Holy Scriptures as interpreted by the Catholic Church; yield to decisions of lesser powers, according to the distinct degree of their authority, so far as we conscientiously can, conformity, compliance, or at least an acquiescence, and believe that any unwitting error being thus implicitly retracted beforehand will be pardoned by the Father of Mercies on the part of all who seriously and sincerely do seek after peace and truth.<sup>2</sup>

dissolve and perish.’ *Mixed Essays* (re-quoted also in ‘Prose Passages’ from Matthew Arnold, p. 186). London, 1880.

<sup>1</sup> *Fraser's Magazine* for February, 1878; being one of a series of papers on Church Schools and Parties, signed ‘R. E. B.’ (vol. xvii. p. 249).

<sup>2</sup> *Works*, p. 141. We have given the abridged substance but not a *verbatim et literalim* reproduction of the Archbishop's words.

## ART. II.—THE MASSORETIC TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

1. *Prolegomena Critica in Vetus Testamentum Hebraicum*. Scripsit HERMANN L. STRACK, Ph.D. (Lipsiæ, MDCCCLXXIII.)
2. *The Variorum Teachers' Edition of the Holy Bible*. With Various Renderings and Readings from the best Authorities. Edited by Rev. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., S. R. DRIVER, M.A., Rev. R. L. CLARKE, M.A., and ALFRED GOODWIN, M.A. (London, 1886.)
3. *Preface to the Revised Version of the Old Testament*. (Oxford, 1885.)

Is the Received Text of the Old Testament more sound or less sound than that of the New? The question is no new one; it was raised as soon as the critical study of the Greek Testament showed what a vast number of various readings was found in the Greek MSS. It was not without a struggle that the existence of these was admitted. When it could no longer be questioned, the battleground was changed to the text of the Hebrew Bible. Here, at least, it was said (as it is sometimes said even now), there cannot be any errors: first, because of the great care taken of the sacred books by the Jews, and secondly, because as a matter of fact the MSS. (it was alleged) all agreed. Some, indeed, went farther, and taking 'the high priori road,' asserted that all copies wherever made must necessarily agree, since it would be inconsistent with the Divine goodness to allow errors to enter into books which contain the Divine revelation. This was a consideration which might have had weight as long as the variations in the text of the Gospels and Epistles were unknown, but which one would think would commend itself to few who held the New Testament to be quite as important as the Old, and who saw how many variations were exhibited in Mill's edition of the former.

The other reasons sounded more plausible, but they also had to give way to facts. For as soon as the MSS. were examined it appeared that Jewish scribes were no more infallible than Greeks or Romans. Mistakes of letters similar in form or in sound, repetitions, omissions, occur frequently. Indeed the first kind of error from confusion of letters similar

in form is, from the peculiarity of the alphabet, more common in Hebrew than in Greek or Latin.

To take the example of one or two MSS. The MS. which Kennicott numbers 5 contains a note by Rabbi Leon Modena, dated 1628, in which he states that after careful examination he has found it faithfully transcribed. He assigns it to the year 1304. Yet this 'faithful transcript' omits nine words in Gen. xix. 30 (from homœoteleuton), and in Exod. viii. omits two entire verses (10 and 11).

From another MS. characterized as good and ancient (Kennicott's 1) we note the following: Gen. xxix. 10, three words omitted ('from the well's mouth'); *ib.* 15, 'my brother' omitted; *ib.* 34, 'a son' omitted; Gen. xxxi. 52, ten words omitted (from 'this heap' to 'this heap'); xxxiii. 18, 'when he came from Padan-Aram' omitted; *ib.* 24, from 'gate of his city' to 'gate of his city' omitted; Exod. xxvii. 12, written twice; Levit. xix. 3, three words repeated; Levit. v. 9, this MS. (not alone) inserts '[of the] congregation' after 'sin-offering'; Levit. xxiii. 29, it adds three words, '[that soul] shall be cut off from [the midst of] his people.'

Another MS. has in 1 Sam. xxiii. 10 two letters inserted from the line below; the scribe discovered his error before completing the word, but has not erased the letters. In 2 Sam. v. 2, the same scribe has similarly inserted, after the word 'said,' the first four letters of 'Israel' from the line above, and has left them unerased. Again in 2 Kings v. 9, the same scribe has inserted 'and stood' a second time before the word 'of-Elisha.'

Let us take a different point of view, and glance at the variations of different MSS. in a single passage, *ex. gr.* 1 Chron. xi. In this one chapter we find that one MS. has twenty-two variations from the printed text. Amongst these are the omission of five words in *v.* 6, of eleven words in *v.* 18, six words in *v.* 23, and three in *v.* 30, all from homœoteleuton. A second MS. has seventeen deviations, including the same omission of eleven words in *v.* 18. Another has thirteen deviations, and again another twenty-eight, including an interpolation of three words in *v.* 2.

The frequency of omissions from homœoteleuton deserves particular notice in view of the fact that there are good reasons for suspecting such omissions in our present text of some of the sacred books. No rules can make scribes infallible. But were not faulty copies destroyed? The answer to this is the fact that faulty copies exist in hundreds; nay, that no copy, even the most esteemed, is without faults.

But if such errors as the above have occurred whilst the scribes have been supposed to be subject to strict rules, and since the compilation of the Massorah, what may not have occurred before? For, be it observed, this care came too late to save the text from many corruptions. With what precision has the *Textus Receptus* of the Greek Testament been reproduced since the age of printing. Is there any reason to suppose that the Books of Samuel, or any particular Psalms, were regarded for two or three centuries after their first publication with as much reverence as the early Christians felt for the Gospels and Epistles? It is to a period far earlier than any of our existing authorities that we owe such errors as may exist in the Hebrew text. Critics speak of ancient and very ancient MSS. But what is implied in the word 'ancient'? Antiquity is relative. The true antiquity of a MS., from a critical point of view, consists, *not in its distance from us, but in its nearness to the author*. A twelfth-century MS. of a work written in the eleventh century would be justly called very ancient; not so a twelfth century MS. of the Gospels. Of these again we possess MSS. not more than three or four centuries removed from the authors, and these we rightly call very ancient. A copy of Isaiah or of the older Psalms of the same relative antiquity would date several centuries before Christ. Now the Revisers' Preface has made every reader acquainted with the fact that the oldest certainly dated MS. of *any part* of the Hebrew Bible is a copy of the Prophets written A.D. 916 (in Odessa).<sup>1</sup> In other words, the true antiquity of our copies, of the older Prophets for example, is not greater than that of a copy of the New Testament written in the seventeenth century. If all Greek MSS. older than the fifteenth century had perished, we should be in a better position as to the text of the New Testament than we are at present as to that of the Old Testament.

But not only are our Hebrew MSS. thus comparatively recent, but the Hebrew text has gone through more perilous vicissitudes than the Greek; and we can point to more than one period in which the channel of transmission became contracted in a very serious manner. First in order we may notice the change of the characters in which the text was

<sup>1</sup> The subscription in the Odessa Pentateuch stating that this book was corrected 1,300 years after the Captivity, i.e. A.D. 580 (Smith's *Dict. Bibl.* ii. p. 604, col. 2), has been proved to be a forgery (Strack, *Theol. Studien u. Krit.*). Of the Firkowitsch Collection of MSS. (now in St. Petersburg) Strack remarks that the whole collection does not contain a single certainly-dated epigraph; and in particular all dates towards the end of the twelfth century are unquestionably falsified (*ibid.* p. 544).

written. The older Hebrew character, as is now well known, was similar to that exhibited on the Moabite stone and in the Siloam inscription. According to ancient Jewish writers the change to the characters now employed, called the square or Assyrian character, was made by Ezra, a man worthy, as they say, to have had the Law given by him, but who had at least the honour of altering the writing of it. As Jewish tradition, however, ascribes to Ezra everything that cannot be ascribed to Moses, it deserves little attention. In the present case, indeed, there is some plausibility in the suggestion. The change points to a time when the people had ceased to be familiar with the ancient—that is, the Hebrew—character, and employed the Aramaic. This corresponds with the period of the Babylonian captivity, when the Hebrew tongue itself probably fell into disuse except partially for literary purposes. It would not, then, be unreasonable to suppose that the copy of the Law which Ezra brought with him to Palestine was in the new character, and that this became the archetype of the recension thereafter current. For there appears no reason to think that copies were more numerous in Palestine amongst the poor left behind in the land than in the days of Josiah, when the finding of a copy in the Temple created so much interest. Certainly the intervening period had not been favourable to the multiplication of copies. The transference of the other books into the new character was probably gradual. Considering the history of the times, we can hardly suppose that there would be a demand for copies for private reading. Nor is it to be assumed that all the books of our canon were regarded as sacred at that time. Of some we know certainly that they were not then canonical.

Whether the change of the written character was begun by Ezra or, as is generally thought, at a later period, is of no consequence, but it is important to note that the change largely increased the chances of errors from the resemblance of letters. Hence in the critical study of the text we have to take into account the possible confusion of letters in the older alphabet as well as in the later.

It may naturally be supposed that after the transference of the ancient books into the new character the older copies would be carefully if not superstitiously preserved. The age of a MS. would be marked by the nature of its writing more decisively than the age of an uncial MS. of the New Testament. The supposition is falsified by the facts. Indeed, it became a rule that books written in the Hebrew character were not sacred. This was no doubt partly owing to the cir-

cumstance that the hated Samaritans still preserved the old letters, even in writing their own dialect, and thus the new writing made an additional distinction between them and the Jews. Thus it was said that the Samaritans wrote their Aramaic books in the Hebrew character, while the Jews wrote their Hebrew books in the Aramaic character. Even at a much later period, however, the Jews showed their reverence for ancient copies of sacred books in a fashion very different from ours. We carefully treasure such old books as the Vatican and Alexandrian; the Jews would have buried them. What happened to the copies in the older Hebrew character we do not know, but, as above suggested, they were probably extremely few. Certain it is that no such copies existed within the memory or knowledge of any ancient writer known to us.

Another change was the introduction of the vowel-letters (not to be confounded with that of the vowels). The books as originally written had few, if any, indications of vowel sounds. In later times it became more and more necessary to fix the pronunciation in ambiguous cases, and the vowel-letters, or *matres lectionis*, were inserted. The process was gradual, and we may observe two things about it: first, the absence of that reverence for the letter of the sacred text which prevailed at a later period, and which would have effectually barred any such meddling with it; and, secondly, the complete disappearance of the older MSS. The vowel-letters were regarded by the Massoretes as part of the original text, and they exhibit no knowledge of any MSS. in which they were not found. There are many instances in which it is important for purposes of criticism to bear in mind that the vowel-letters are not part of the original text.

Now such a change could not be introduced into many copies independently without much more variation than we actually find. We may, therefore, not unreasonably conjecture that at this epoch the channel of transmission was limited to a very few, perhaps one or two, codices. The addition of the vowel-points marks another stage in the history of the text, on which, however, we need not dwell, as these are universally admitted to be comparatively recent; that is, not earlier than the seventh century.

In addition to these internal changes we may notice at least three periods of peril from without. First, in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, when the Temple was burnt and his soldiers destroyed every copy of the Law on which they could lay hands, and doubtless showed no consideration for other books, since to them all Hebrew books would look pretty



much the same. Again at the destruction of Jerusalem, and, lastly, half a century later, in the time of Hadrian, at Bethur, where the Jews made their final stand, and where it is said that thousands of scholars and their books were cast into the flames. After making all allowance for exaggeration, there remains enough to show that there was a very large destruction of copies of the Scriptures.

In these successive catastrophes, the like of which has never occurred to the New Testament, the accuracy of a copy would give it no greater chance of preservation. 'The survival of the fittest' would not be the law which governed this. On the contrary, the more public copies, which we may suppose would be also the most correct, would be the most certain to be found and destroyed. The copy of the Law brought to Rome by Titus was doubtless the standard Temple copy.

Mention of the Temple copy leads us to remark that, while the Pentateuch was usually copied by men acquainted with the Law, the other books were in the hands of a class of copyists who made this their special business, in addition to being employed as elementary teachers and public readers. These were generally poor, and many of them thought only of speed in their work. It was said of them that their poverty was a judgment on them for their neglect in copying, of which, indeed, we have already given some instances. One old writer, enumerating those for whom Gehenna is prepared, includes these copyists. The best of them, however, devoted much labour and intelligence to the verbal study of the Scriptures. To these we owe the vowel-points, introduced at first in order to assist in teaching the young. To them also we owe the beginnings of the Massorah. This may be summarily described as a mass of grammatical, lexicographical, and concordantial notices. These are not, indeed, what the modern reader might expect from this description, for they do not contain comments or explanations of the peculiarities noted, but merely catalogue the facts as in an index. A short extract will give a better idea of the Massorah as it appears in the Rabbinic Bible than any description. We take the extract from Exodus ii :—

Ver. 1. "And there went a man of the house of": twice, thus connected, and the references are "And there went a man of the house of Levi"; "of the house of Lehem [*i.e.* of Bethlehem] Judah."

Ver. 2. "And she hid him": not again. "Three months": "months" four times. "And hid him three months"; "for the precious things of the growth of" [the moons, Deut. xxxiii. 14]; "Canst thou number the months that they fulfil" [Job xxxix. 2].

Ver. 3. "And [when] she could not": twice; "hide-him": not again. "Papyrus": thrice: "and she took for him an ark of"; "and in vessels of papyrus upon the waters" [Is. xviii. 2]; "can the papyrus grow" [Job viii. 11]. Also once "and-papyrus": "grass with seeds and papyrus" [Is. xxxv. 7]; "and-daubed-it": one of fifteen words in which the final *He* is not marked with mappik [as it might be expected to be since it stands for the suffix "it"], and which are likely to mislead. [These are enumerated in the "Great Massorah" at the end of the Rabbinic Bible, to which the more lengthy notices were relegated by the editor. There is a note here to that effect.]

Ver. 5. "At the river": five times [which are enumerated].

The word here rendered 'river' is not the equivalent of 'flumen,' but is a word appropriated to the Nile and its channels. The Massorah does not mention this, but simply gives references to the places where it occurs.

Sometimes a *memoria technica* is given, as, for example, with reference to the irregularity of 'all the days was,' instead of 'were,' in the case of Enoch, Lamech, and Noah (doubtless a mere clerical error), the *memoria technica* is made up of the initials of these three names. Some Massorettes give only two of these instances, and many MSS. read 'were.' Sometimes, again, a slightly different reading is mentioned either as *Qerê* (of which more presently) or as conjecture, but no information is given either as to MS. authority or as to signification. The nearest approach to this is when a word is said *e.g.* to occur twice 'in two significations.'

Much of the contents of the Massorah finds its nearest modern analogy in the marginal notes in Alford's Greek Testament which inform us by means of symbols whether certain words, phrases, or constructions are unique, or, if they occur only two or three times, give us references to these occurrences. If instead of chapter and verse these references were by a few words of the context, the resemblance would be at once manifest; but the Massorettes did not possess the convenience of numbered chapters and verses. These notices are the result of the observations of many generations of scholars; they are not the work of an authoritative college of revisers or editors. Moreover these scholars presuppose a received text; they did not constitute it.

There is one part of the Massorah which appears in every printed edition—namely, the marginal readings, to which is prefixed the initial letter of 'Qerê,' 'read' (= *lectum*, or rather *legendum*, not = *lege*), the textual reading being called 'Kethibh' or 'written.' It is important to ascertain the nature and source

of these readings. In the first place, when a coarse expression occurs in the text a more decent word is substituted; secondly, grammatical forms supposed to be incorrect are corrected in the margin; and, thirdly, letters supposed to be wrongly written are corrected, so that the sense is different. In a few cases either a word written in the text is omitted or a word omitted in the text is supplied. There are some words of frequent occurrence which are always altered by the reader, and in the case of these there is no marginal note, the vowels in the text being sufficient to remind the reader of the necessary substitution. Each of these is called a *Qerê perpetuum*.

It would be a mistake to suppose that we owe all these marginal readings to the Massoretes. Some of them at least, we know to be much older and possibly all may be so. Now the question arises, Are these *Qerês* various readings from MSS. or not? Here we observe in the first place that some at least are certainly not so (those, namely, which substitute a more decent for a coarse expression), and that there is no difference in the way in which these and the others are introduced. This is already against the supposition that the latter are MS. readings. But again we are not without information as to the way in which various readings were dealt with by the early pre-Massoretic critics. It is related in the Talmud that once upon a time three copies of the Law were found in the Temple, each of which had one reading different from the other two. In each instance the reading of the two was adopted, and that of the one rejected. Most likely there were other differences and one is mentioned merely as a specimen. This method of deciding between two readings by numbering MSS. without weighing them is characteristic of the infancy of criticism, especially in the present case, where one of the readings was not even Hebrew, but a Greek word adopted into Aramaic (the word *ζητηται*). Yet the MS. which exhibited this obviously corrupt text was treated as of equal authority with the others. We learn from this narrative not only that corrupt readings were known to have crept into MSS., but that even the standard MSS. were not free from them, and that no attempt was made to discriminate between the good and the bad copies. But we learn further that the reading believed to be correct was put in the text. This may seem so inevitable as to make the statement superfluous. But those who regard the *Qerês* as readings gathered from MSS. must tacitly suppose the reverse. For there is no uncertainty about the *Qerê*; it is not introduced with 'perhaps thus' or 'some read thus,' but with an implicit direction to read so

and so. The text is only 'written,' the margin is 'read.' Nay the Massorettes who supplied the vowel points have done their best to put it out of the power of the reader to read the text as written. If it is a word that is to be omitted, they give it no vowels; if a word is to be added, the vowels stand in their place without the consonants; if one word is to be substituted for another, the vowels of the word 'read' appear in the text, and cannot be read with the 'written' consonants without impropriety, sometimes not without producing a grammatical monstrosity. There is no doubt, then, about the preference given to the Qerê. But what should we think of critics who, having compared MSS. and judged one of two readings to be better supported than the other, place the wrong reading in the text and banish the correct one to the margin? There is no analogy to the case of an editor of a printed text who may retain a reading which he thinks not the best supported. A printed text is in occupation of the field in a way that no MS. can be, for it means the same identical text in the hands of thousands of persons, and moreover carries with it the *præjudicium* that its editor, with possibly the same materials, regarded its text as the best supported. Yet even the editor of a printed text, when he does not venture on emendation, does not hesitate to correct obvious misprints. Suppose we found in a printed book 'By the side of the wav'; margin, 'read *way*'; 'alein,' margin, read *alien*; 'thoart,' margin, 'read *throat*'; 'the broad . . .'; margin, 'read *broad road*'; 'the length five five cubits,' margin, 'omit the second *five*:' should we think that the editor was giving the result of a collation of MSS.? Should we not rather conclude with certainty that he was giving in his text an exact reproduction of a single MS.? Now there are amongst the Qerê exact parallels to each of these hypothetical instances. We infer, then, with equally good reason, that these are not various readings collected from MSS., but critical emendations of a text judged to be corrupt. They attest, not the presence, but the absence of MS. authority, and it is this alone that explains the fact that the reading believed to be genuine was not put in the text. It also explains why the changes are so small, not always as to sense but as to the letters: just such as a cautious and reverent critic would limit himself to. They are sufficient to show that these ancient critics thought that the text needed correction; they rarely give help where more than a single letter is astray.

It is no objection to this that some MSS. in certain cases exhibit the Qerê in the text and the Kethibh in the margin.

Some copyists would naturally on the authority of the Massorettes insert the Qerê in the text; others, not inquiring into the original intention, would regard these as various readings. The translators of the English Bible appear to have thought themselves at liberty to choose between the Qerê and the Kethibh as of equal authority. But if any of the Qerês are really various readings, not conjectural, we have no means of distinguishing them from the rest. There is another class of marginal readings which openly profess to be conjectures, 'Sebirim.' These are not without importance, but for our purpose it is sufficient to mention the fact of their existence.

The scantiness of MS. resources thus indicated is only what we might have expected from the history of the text as sketched above. Indeed, it would hardly be matter of astonishment should we find that all existing copies were derived from a single one, or even that at more than one epoch only one copy—we do not say existed, but—served as archetype to our present text.

If this had been actually the fact, how should we be able to discover it? Mere uniformity of reading might support a conjecture, but would be insufficient for proof of a common source, since the coincident readings might possibly be original. Even an ingenious conjecture might be borrowed by one copyist from another. If, however, there is reason to suppose some of these coincident readings not to be genuine, then we have advanced a step towards the proof that the agreeing MSS. are derived from a common source. This might only mean that they represent a single critical recension. In general this inference as to the genuineness of particular readings can only reach probability in a higher or lower degree; but in one class of readings, if we may call them so, it reaches certainty: we mean in the case of palpable errors. If two or more MSS., for instance, agree very frequently in their errors of omission or repetition or of transcription of single words, this can only be explained on the hypothesis of a common origin, not in this case from one critical recension, but from one uncorrected copy.

Now let us see whether traces of this kind are to be found in our Hebrew text. We have seen already that omissions (chiefly from homœoteleuton) are not unusual in existing copies. We shall find evidence of the like omissions in the Massoretic text. The first we shall notice is Joshua xxi. 36, 37 (the names of the four cities of refuge in the tribe of Reuben). These verses are, indeed, in many printed texts and in many MSS., but we have good ancient authority for

the statement that they were absent from all 'correct' copies. The omission was so obvious and important and so easily corrected from 1 Chron. vi. 78, 79, that many copyists and editors thought fit to supply the missing words either in the margin or in the text.

Other omissions equally certain were not so obtrusive, and have consequently not been corrected by the copyists. As one example let us take Gen. xxxvi. 11. Here we read: 'The sons of Eliphaz were Teman, Omar, Zepho, and Gatam, and Kenaz, And Timna [was concubine to Eliphaz, Esau's son, and she bare to Eliphaz] Amalek.' Now in 1 Chron. i. 36 the bracketed words are omitted ('and,' which is then obviously necessary, being inserted before 'Amalek'). The omitted words constituted exactly one line of the usual length. By the omission Timna is made to be a son of Eliphaz instead of his concubine.

Another instance. In 2 Sam. xxiii. 9 we read:—

'After him was Eleazar the son of Dodo the Ahohite, one of the three mighty men with David, when they defied the Philistines that were gathered together to battle [and the men of Israel were gone away. He arose, and smote the Philistines until his hand was weary, and his hand clave unto the sword: and the Lord wrought a great victory that day; and the people returned after him only to spoil. And after him was Shammah the son of Agee the Hararite. And the Philistines were gathered together into a troop], where was a piece of ground full of lentils ('barley,' *Chron.*); and the people fled from the Philistines. But he ('they,' *Chron.*) stood in the midst of the ground, and defended it, and slew the Philistines; and the Lord wrought a great victory.'

In 1 Chron. xi. 13 all the words in brackets are omitted, thus leaving out entirely the exploit of one of the three and the name of the next, by which the exploit of the third is wrongly attributed to the second.

1 Chron. iv. 3: 'These were the father of Etam.' Either 'father' is a mistake for 'sons' (which the Sept. and Vulg. have) or 'sons of' is omitted before 'father.' Some modern copyists have adopted one or other of these corrections.

Again, 1 Chron. vi. 28, the Hebrew text reads: 'The sons of Samuel, the first-born and second and Abiah.' The name of the first-born being omitted, 'and second' is treated as his name, and the word 'and' inserted before Abiah. In the previous verse the name of Samuel as son of Elkanah is omitted.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There is also an error in v. 26: 'Elkanah his son, Elkanah.'



Repetitions are generally due to eye-error of the same kind as that which produces omissions. One or two examples may be cited. 2 Sam. vi. 3, 4 :—

'And they set the ark of God upon a new cart [Heb. a cart a new] and brought it out of the house of Abinadab that was in Gibeah; and Uzzah and Ahio, the sons of Abinadab, drave the new cart [Heb. the cart a new] and brought it out of the house of Abinadab that was in Gibeah with the ark of God.'

The italicized words are a repetition occasioned by the eye of the scribe going back about two lines from the second 'cart' to the first. The A. V. makes some slight changes, but the Hebrew words are identical with the preceding. The repetition causes a solecism, since the adjective ought to have the article when it is joined with a noun having the article.

Prov. x. 10: 'But a prating fool shall fall' is repeated from v. 8. This repetition displaces the genuine conclusion of v. 10.

A very remarkable repetition is that of 1 Chron. viii. 29-38 in the following chapter ix. 35-44, a repetition occasioned doubtless by the occurrence of the words 'dwelt in Jerusalem' in both places. A comparison shows us further an omission of 'and Ahaz' in ix. 41; of 'and Ner' in viii. 30; and of 'and Mikloth' in viii. 31; probably also of 'Jehiel' in viii. 29; besides other minor differences.

We may be permitted to direct attention to two instances of repetition (as it seems to us) which have not been generally recognized. The first is in Levit. xx. 10 :—

'A man that commits adultery with the wife of  
a man that commits adultery with the wife of  
his neighbour.'

Here the punctuators have endeavoured to make sense of the repetition by placing a stop after the second 'man.' But 'the wife of a man' for 'the wife of another man' or 'of his neighbour' is a strange expression if even possible.

The other instance is Exod. xxx. 6: 'Thou shalt put it before the vail that is by the ark of the testimony [before the mercy seat that is over the testimony].' 'Over' is the same word as 'by,' and the word for 'mercy seat' differs from that for 'vail' only in the order of the letters. The Samaritan text has not the repetition which makes the verse somewhat difficult.

Another kind of error we said to be common in modern Hebrew MSS., viz. the slipping in of a word from a line above or below. Of this also we have undoubted instances in the

Massoretic text. Thus 2 Sam. xvii. 28: 'flour and parched and beans and lentiles and parched.' In 1 Chron. xx. 5 we read: 'And slew Elhanan the son of Jair eth-Lahmi, the brother of Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a beam of the weavers.' In 2 Sam. xxi. 19 the parallel passage reads: 'And slew Elhanan the son of Jaare weavers [*oregim*] beth haLahmi eth-Goliath the Gittite, the staff of whose spear was like a beam of the weavers.' Here it is obvious that the word 'weavers' [*oregim*] has slipped in after the name of Jair from the next line. With lines of the normal Hebrew length the word stood just below, as it does in the edition of the Bible Society. The word 'brother of' [*achi*] has been misread as the sign of the accusative 'eth,' and then in harmony with this 'eth-Lahmi' has been supposed to stand for 'beth ha lahmi' = 'the Bethlehemite,' or more probably it was first read as 'beth lahmi,' and then by way of grammatical correction the article was inserted. However, if anyone prefers to give a different account of the corruption it is the same for our purpose. One of the texts, at least, is corrupt, if not both.

Another notable instance occurs in the history of David's mighty men. In 1 Chron. xi. 11 we read of the exploit of Jashobeam, the son of Hachmoni. In 2 Sam. xxiii. 7, 8, we read as follows: 'Shall be utterly burned with fire in the seat [A. V. 'in the same place']. These be the names of the mighty men whom David had: Josheb in the seat Tahchmoni.' Here again, according to the regular length of the line of the ancient scribes, the second 'in the seat' is just under the first. And there can be no doubt that it slipped in by an error of eye. The consonants of 'Josheb' are the same as the first three of 'Jashobeam,' and the present vocalization, which makes it mean 'sitting,' is of course due to the words 'in the seat' which now follow. There is reason to believe that 'Jashobeam' is not the original form of the name; but this does not now concern us. It is to our purpose, however, to observe that there is another error in the latter part of the same verse, which reads thus (according to the Qerê, which the A. V. follows): 'He [was] Adino the Eznite against eight hundred.' The parallel in Chronicles has 'he lifted up his spear against three hundred.' Not to dwell on the difference in the number, it is manifest that 'Adino the Eznite' must stand for some words meaning 'lifted up his spear.' A slight alteration in the letters of the text gives two words which, interpreted from the Arabic, yield this sense. The A. V. supplies the words 'he lift up his spear,' just as in

2 Sam. xxi. 19 it adds 'brother of'; both additions being in fact conjectural emendations of the Hebrew text. Readers are so accustomed to these and a few other emendations in the A. V. that they forget their real significance. Or do they think that the right of critical emendation belonged to Jewish scribes in early times and to English scholars up to 1611, and then was lost?

A third example we take from 1 Kings vi. 8: 'The door of the middle chamber [was] in the right side of the house, and they went up with winding stairs into the middle, and out of the middle into the third.' Here the first 'middle' has slipped in from the line below instead of 'lowest' (compare verse 6).

Nor can we doubt that the same explanation is to be given of the difference between Psalm xviii. 4 and 2 Sam. xxii. 5: 'The sorrows [Heb. cords] of death compassed me, and the floods of ungodly men made me afraid.' The text in Samuel has 'the billows of death compassed me,' which agrees well with the parallelism, and 'cords' may easily have slipped in from the following verse.

Transposition of lines or verses arises probably from a line or verse being in the first instance omitted, and then supplied in the margin and inserted in the wrong place. An example of such transposition is found in Isaiah xxxviii. 21, 24: 'And Isaiah said, Let them take a lump of figs,' &c. 'And Hezekiah said, What is the sign that I shall go up to the house of the Lord?' The A. V. renders the verbs as pluperfect, which is in fact not grammatically admissible. When they are correctly rendered the inversion is obvious. The parallel passage in 2 Kings xx. 7, 8, has the verses in the right order. No doubt verse 22 was at first omitted, the eye of the scribe passing from 'the house of the Lord' in verse 20 to the same words in the following verse.

An undoubted transposition of two words occurs in Psalm xxxv. 7: 'Without cause have they hid for me a pit; their net without cause have they digged for my soul.' Punctuators, commentators, and translators (not excepting the Revised Version) have variously attempted to make sense out of the words in their present order. What is required is simply to transpose the words 'a pit' and 'their net.'

The letters D and R were similar in the older writing, but much more so in the later. In fact, in many texts it requires close attention to distinguish them. Where the confusion only turns Hadadezer into Hadarezer, or Benhadad into Benhadar,

it is a slight matter; but when it changes Edom into Syria (Aram), or *vice versa*, it is serious. Now this happens, for example, in 2 Sam. viii. 12, 13, compared with 1 Chron. xviii. 11, 12. In the latter of these two verses we read in Samuel: 'David gat him a name [or made him a monument] when he returned from smiting Syria in the valley of salt eighteen thousand men.' In Chronicles we have: 'Moreover, Abishai the son of Zeruiah smote Edom in the valley of salt eighteen thousand men.' In the superscription of Psalm lx. we read that after David's war with Syria, 'Joab returned and smote Edom in the valley of salt eighteen thousand men.' It is probable, indeed, that there is omission in Samuel of some words such as 'and he smote Edom' (which some versions have); as, with the change only of Aram to Edom, the mention of this great victory is strangely indirect.

A notable instance of the confusion of D and R is in Joshua ix. 4, where it is said that the Gibeonites 'went and made-as-if-they-were-ambassadors,' &c. This is an ingenious interpretation of a word not elsewhere found; it is open to the objection that they were really ambassadors, not merely in pretence. A substitution of D for R gives us the same word that occurs in verse 12, 'gat them provision.' A few MSS. have this reading, which the Versions support.

In 2 Sam. xxii. 11 we read: 'And he rode upon a cherub, and did fly, and was seen on the wings of the wind.' That the Almighty was 'seen' on the wind is not a poetical but an extravagant idea, and the last that would occur to a Hebrew poet. The text of the Psalm supplies the correct rendering, 'came flying,' the difference being only that between D and R. The verb being rarer than the verb to 'see,' the mistake easily occurred. In this case, however, a large number of MSS. in Samuel have the reading of the Psalm (probably taken from it), whilst a few in the Psalms have the reading of the Book of Samuel.

The same confusion and in the same root has given rise to a doublet in Deut. xiv. 13 (compare Levit. xiv. 14). Amongst the birds that may not be eaten the latter book enumerates two of the hawk kind: the *daah* and *ayah*. The book of Deut. has instead, the *raah* and the *ayah* and the *dayah*. Not only is the *raah* an entirely unknown bird, but it is unreasonable to suppose an addition to the list of forbidden birds. It is, on the contrary, very reasonable to suppose a mistake of D for R. But how has the third word got in? No doubt it was a marginal correction for *raah*, and has crept into the text as marginal emendations often do, and its

form may be due to an error of assimilation to the preceding word, or it may be a genuine alternative form of the name *daah*.<sup>1</sup>

In 2 Chron. xxii. 10, we read (in the Massoretic text) that Athaliah 'arose and spake all the seed royal.' Probably no advocate of the received Hebrew text will defend this. Part of the error is the mistake of D for R, the remainder is probably due to the oscitancy of the scribe. A few MSS. read 'destroyed' but in such a case this is almost certainly a correction from recollection of the parallel in the Book of Kings.

There is another remarkable error partly of ear and partly of eye which we must not omit to mention. It is in 2 Sam. vi. 5, where we read that 'David and all the house of Israel rejoiced before Jehovah with all [manner of instruments made of] firwood' (or cypress). 'Manner of' may fairly be added by a translator, but hardly 'instruments of.' The literal rendering is 'with all kinds of sticks of firtrees, and on harps,' &c. Their music was doubtless what we should consider rude, but scarcely so rude as this would make it. The Book of Chronicles (1 Chron. xiii. 8) gives us what is no doubt the true reading, 'with all their might and with singing.' The difference in the Hebrew letters is inconsiderable, the chief being that between two sibilants, easily confounded.

There are many instances in which according to the Massorah itself, prepositions, &c., of similar sound but different significations are confounded. These errors do not appear in the A. V., which in such cases gives the correct sense.

We mention another instance in which the confusion of D and R is combined with a transposition of letters. Isa. vii. 12, 13: 'Say ye not, A confederacy, to all them to whom this people shall say, A confederacy; neither fear ye their fear, nor be afraid. Sanctify Jehovah of Hosts Himself, and let Him be your fear, and let Him be your dread.' By the changes mentioned we substitute for 'a confederacy,' a 'holy thing.' 'Call not that holy which this people call holy, neither fear ye their fear,' &c. Thus the two clauses of this verse correspond to the clauses of verse 13.

A few other palpable errors in the Massoretic text are:—

<sup>1</sup> Or we might suppose that *dayah* got into the text first by this error of assimilation, and that there was a marginal correction *daah* which was misread *raah*, and in this form entered the text. But it is more likely that the order of the names was the same in both places.

1 Sam. xiii. i.: 'Saul was a year old when he began to reign.' So the Hebrew, as the Revisers correctly state in their margin.

2 Sam. iii. 7: the name of 'Ishbosheth' omitted (suggested by Versions).

2 Chron. iii. 4: the height of the porch 'an hundred and twenty cubits.'

2 Chron. xxii. 6: 'to be healed in Jezreel because of the wounds.' The English 'because of' is as incorrect as a translation as would be a similar translation of the Greek *διὰ*. The Revisers very properly note the error of the Hebrew text in their margin, and follow in their text the parallel passage and the Versions.

Jer. xxvii. 1: 'Jehoiakim' instead of 'Zedekiah.'

Josh. xxii. 54: 'And the children of Reuben and the children of Gad called the altar . . . for it is a witness between us.' The name of the altar (no doubt 'Ed' = 'witness,' as in the Syriac) has fallen out.

The textual errors which obtrude themselves most on the English reader are those in numerical statements detected by the aid of parallel passages: such as the 'eight hundred' in 1 Chron. xi. 11, against 'three hundred' in Samuel; 'seven thousand' in 1 Chron. xix. 18, against 'seven hundred' in 2 Sam. x. 18; 'seven thousand' in 1 Chron. xviii. 4, against 'seven hundred' in 2 Sam. viii. 4 (if we adopt the word 'chariots' conjecturally supplied from Chronicles by the English Version, otherwise 'seventeen hundred'); Solomon's 'forty thousand' stalls for his horses, 1 Kings, iv. 26, against 'four thousand' in 2 Chron. ix. 25; the 'forty-two years' of Ahaziah when he began to reign, 2 Chron. xxii. 12, against 'twenty-two' in 2 Kings viii. 26, and the fact that his father was only forty at his death; with very many others. The point of view from which these are usually looked at, is that of discrepancies to be reconciled, and the reconciliation is effected by showing how easily a scribe might mistake one numerical letter for another, or, after a numeration founded on the Arabic was adopted, add a cipher. Very good; but let us understand all that is involved in this explanation. As an explanation of such errors in a single MS. it is perfect; when it is applied to the phenomenon of all or nearly all MSS. agreeing in the same errors, it means that they are all derived from one copy in which these errors existed. To suppose that scores, nay hundreds of copyists should fall into the same series of errors in the same places, all copying correctly in one place and all committing just the same error



in the same context in another place: this is to suppose something utterly beyond belief.

The evidence thus furnished that our MSS. are all derived from one copy, and that a copy far from being faultless, is so decisive that it scarcely needs further support. But further evidence there is, and of a very curious kind.

There are several words which have one or all their letters dotted. These dots are of great antiquity, much older than the Massorettes; they are mentioned by Jerome, and discussed in the Talmud and Midrashim, where some rather farfetched explanations are given. For instance in the account of the meeting of Esau and Jacob (Gen. xxxiii. 4), the word 'and-kissed-him,' has every letter dotted. This, says one, is to show that the kiss was sincere. Nay, but to show that it was insincere, says another. It indicates, says a third, that Esau really meant to bite Jacob, but the neck of the latter was miraculously turned to marble: the dots are the teeth of Esau. Such absurdities have a value as indications that the dots had been handed down with the text for so long a time, that their meaning was forgotten. But their true significance was understood by some of the Rabbinical authorities, nor is it far to seek. Everyone who has studied MSS. knows that it is the custom of scribes when they have written a word or letter erroneously to mark the error by dots. In some beautifully-written MSS. these dots are within the letter, not above. Thus while the attentive reader is admonished and the character of the scribe saved, the beauty of his MS. is not spoiled as it would be had he drawn his pen through the erroneous letters or erased them. Not only is this the case with Greek and Latin scribes, but also in our Hebrew MSS. there are instances of the same practice. And that this was the true account of these ancient dots was well understood by an ancient Jewish authority, who attributes the dots to Ezra. When Ezra, says he, was asked why he dotted these letters, he replied: 'When Elijah comes, if he asks me why I have written so-and-so, I shall answer I have already dotted it [*i.e.* deleted it], but if he asks me why I have dotted the letters, then I will erase the dots.' One has heard of students at an examination, who, when uncertain whether what they have written is correct, draw the pen lightly through it, trusting that if it is right the examiner will give them credit for it, and that if it is wrong he will give them credit for the erasure. They are probably not aware that the device, if not as old as Ezra, is at least as old as the Rabbi who relates the story.

In Numbers iii. 39, the word 'and-Aaron,' is dotted be-

cause as the Midrash rightly remarks, Aaron did not join Moses in the numbering. 'Moses and Aaron' was so frequent a combination that the scribe erroneously wrote it here, and detecting his error, marked the latter word with the sign of deletion.

In Numbers xxi. 30, the last letter of '*shr*' = 'which' is dotted, *i.e.* deleted, leaving the word '*sh*' = 'fire,' viz. 'with fire.' So the Septuagint reads.

Psalm xxvii. 13, reads in the A. V., '*I had fainted unless I had believed to see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living.*' '*I had fainted*' is rather too strong an ellipsis.<sup>1</sup> But the word '*unless*' is dotted. Probably in this case the dots are only partially right. Taking the consonants alone they yield the two words *lō* = 'to him' and *lō* = 'not': forms often confounded. It is possible that the former word was first written, then the scribe, observing his error, dotted it and wrote the correct form. On this supposition we obtain the excellent sense '*I did not believe that I should see the goodness of the Lord in the land of the living.*' Some critics retaining the first *lō* connect it with the previous verse, translating verse 13 in the same way. The LXX seem to have done this. In following the dots we are following a far more ancient authority than the Massorettes, who vocalize the consonants so as to make the sense '*unless.*' In this, as in most of the instances which have been adduced, the Revisers have left the Authorized Version unchanged.

In Isaiah viii. 9, the first '*they*' is dotted, and the Revisers, following this indication, have omitted it. (The second '*they*' is included in the verb.)

Further, when a passage had been written in a wrong place it was enclosed in square brackets. These brackets having the shape of the Hebrew letter Nun inverted, were called '*inverted Nuns,*' and fanciful meanings were assigned to them by some. But the more learned Rabbis knew their true meaning. An example is Numbers x. 35, 36, which, according to some authorities, were thus marked as constituting a book of themselves, thus dividing the Pentateuch into seven books. These verses, it may be remarked, are placed in the LXX before verse 34, which is probably where the corrector intended them to stand.

<sup>1</sup> We have heard a preacher dwell with emphasis on this very forcible expression '*of the Psalmist.*' Yet without being a Hebrew scholar he needed only to look at the Bible Version to see that the expression is not the Psalmist's but the translators.

whi  
anti  
thos  
well  
reco  
part  
know  
copi  
slips  
thes  
inev  
copy  
coin  
cuss  
than  
have  
are c

I  
MSS  
resto

N

and

Wha

origi

exam

not

The

in th

it wo

corre

which

all co

identi

teent

a tran

valua

babbl

indee

not S

be rej

Old L

Prayer

Thus,

unto

There are many other peculiarities affecting single letters which are faithfully reproduced in all correct copies, and the antiquity and supposed authority of which are attested (as of those just mentioned) by the Massorah and the Talmud as well as other authorities. These were all faithfully copied, recorded, and commented on, because they were regarded as part of the sacred text. The ancient Rabbinical authorities know nothing of a difference in this respect between different copies. But that even two scribes should make the same slips and the same corrections in the same places, and in these only, is an incredible supposition. The conclusion is inevitable, that the traditional text was derived from a single copy in which these peculiarities existed. These remarkable coincidences have one advantage over those previously discussed: they carry us back to a period centuries earlier than the Massorah itself. It appears, then, that the Revisers have not been too bold when they asserted that all our copies are derived from one recension.

In this state of things what is our resource? Not in MSS. The utmost that these can do is to enable us to restore the text of, say, the seventh century.

Nothing remains but the Versions, and of these the oldest, and for this purpose the most important, is that of the LXX. What! some one may exclaim; employ a version to emend the original? Would you correct the text of Shakespeare, for example, from a German translation? No, we reply, we do not propose to emend the original text, but to restore it. The word 'original' tends to impose on the reader. The text in the original tongue is frequently not the original text. If it would be absurd to use a translation of Shakespeare to correct our copies, it is because we possess the identical copy which the translator must have used, since for critical purposes all copies of the same printed edition may be considered identical. But if all the English copies older than the nineteenth century had perished (with all critical commentaries) a translation executed in the sixteenth century would be very valuable. We might have to learn from it that, *e.g.*, 'a babbled o' green fields' was not the original text. No doubt, indeed, the suggestion that this happy touch of nature was not Shakespeare's but was due to a prosy commentator would be rejected with ridicule. Again, if the Septuagint and the Old Latin versions of the Psalms had been lost, the English Prayer-Book version would often enable us to recover them. Thus, 'Bring unto the Lord, O ye mighty, bring young rams unto the Lord,' would reveal the fact that the later Greek

copies contained side by side two versions of the same Hebrew words, and critical sagacity might succeed even in ascertaining what the original words were. If, in addition, we had the Bible version, those Hebrew words could be restored with certainty.

An objection often made to the critical use of the LXX is that the translators were often ignorant, made great mistakes, or paraphrased the text rather than translated it, so that it is often impossible to say what the text before them actually was. These objections, however plausible, are really fallacious. Let us illustrate the case by that of MSS. If two MSS. are offered to us, one of which is distinctly and, as regards orthography, correctly written, and perfect; while the other is mutilated, full of such blunders in spelling as ignorant scribes are wont to make, and sometimes quite illegible, the ordinary reader would have no hesitation in preferring the former. But the critic may have good reason for preferring the other. If he does not, it will be for reasons of a quite different kind. He knows that the corruptions most difficult to deal with are those that are purposely introduced by learned and ingenious copyists. Mistakes in spelling and the like he can allow for, but intentional emendations cannot be removed without the help of other codices. It is just the same with translations. The more unskilful a translator is and the more negligent he is of the difference of idiom in the two languages, the more easy it is to restore the original. As to paraphrase, the fact is that in some parts of the Old Testament the translator is painfully literal. The translator who writes (2 Sam. xxiv. 3) *προσθήη Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς πρὸς τὸν λαὸν ὥσπερ αὐτοὺς καὶ ὥσπερ αὐτοὺς* has indeed translated badly, but he has enabled us to retranslate his text with infallible certainty. We are not, however, required to retranslate the Greek text into its original Hebrew; the problem is a much simpler one. It is whether the Greek can be reconciled with our present Hebrew consonants, and, if not, whether the difference can be accounted for by error, on one side or the other, of the kind usual with scribes? This is frequently very easy to do. A somewhat extreme illustration of this is furnished by the passage in Judges xii. 6. This passage stands alone in this respect, that not only could we not reproduce the Hebrew from the Septuagint version, but that from no possible Greek version could this be done. For the point of it lies in the difference between two sounds, which a Greek-speaking Jew could no more distinguish than a German Jew could distinguish English *t*/*h* from *t*, or the Hebrew word which we call Mikraoth from Mikraos. Such

a tra  
char  
were  
trans  
migh  
word  
lation  
way  
they  
B  
that  
has n  
taine  
we sp  
some  
read  
lessen  
no do  
W  
or the  
illegib  
exactl  
would  
any kn  
one, bu  
ferent  
differen  
more s  
not see  
were so  
was tra  
some c  
whole s  
text? t  
who mu  
were in  
this cir  
ment w  
Massore  
give tra  
study o  
teachers  
porary M  
much ol  
agree, th

a translator might attempt to write the Hebrew word in Greek characters, and then he would have to say that the Ephraimites were told to say 'Sibboleth' and said 'Sibboleth,' or he might translate the word, or, thirdly, seeing the absurdity of this, he might simply say that the men were asked to say some pass-word. We have specimens of the last two attempts at translation; and, notwithstanding the insuperable difficulty in the way of the Greek translators, no reader can fail to see that they had our present text before them.

But what we wish particularly to impress on the reader is that the difficulty of ascertaining the translator's Hebrew text has nothing whatever to do with the value of it when ascertained. It is just as in the case of the illegible MS. of which we spoke. There are valuable MSS., the reading of which in some passages is very uncertain, and which different critics read in different ways; but no one ever thought that this lessens the importance of those readings about which there is no doubt.

What should we not give for a Hebrew MS. of the Psalms or the Prophets dating from A.D. 1, even if it were an almost illegible palimpsest! Now the version of the LXX is to us exactly what such a MS. badly written and sometimes illegible would be; but then this MS. is a thousand years older than any known Hebrew MS. We have spoken of it as if it were one, but it is not to be forgotten that the versions of the different parts of the Hebrew Bible were actually made at different times and by different persons, some of whom were more skilled, some more closely literal, than others. Does it not seem rather inconsistent to maintain that Jewish copyists were so scrupulously exact that the text of the sacred books was transmitted accurately for more than a thousand, or in some cases nearly two thousand, years, and yet that of the whole series of translators not one was able to obtain a correct text? to say nothing of the later Syriac and Greek translators, who must have been equally unfortunate. These translators were indeed much later, and in that respect of less value; but this circumstance rather adds to the weight of their agreement with the LXX when they happen to be opposed to the Massoretic text. Then we have Jerome, too late, indeed, to give traces of the early state of the text, but whose critical study of it and his constant intercourse with his Jewish teachers place him as a witness far above any single contemporary MS., if such existed. And he, be it remembered, is much older than the Massorah. When the LXX and Syriac agree, their combined weight is very great, though not equally

so in all the books. When Jerome and the older translators agree, the external evidence for their reading is preponderating. When a commentator rejects a reading thus supported on the ground that 'not a single Hebrew MS.' reads so, it is as reasonable as if a reading of  $\aleph$  A B C in the Greek Testament were rejected because not found in a single copy later than the sixteenth century.

The prestige attaching to numbers is so natural that a few lines may be well devoted to showing how ill-founded it is. Perhaps the fallacy is fostered by the habit of calling MSS. 'witnesses.' The copies made immediately from the original are indeed direct witnesses to its reading, but all others are so only very indirectly. In the case of these first copies the reading of a majority would certainly have a presumption in its favour, and yet it is pretty certain that sometimes the minority would be right. Let us suppose that there were five of these first copies; each of these would probably become the source of one or more. But their fecundity would be unequal, and would depend on extraneous circumstances. One might be the parent of five, another of three, a third perhaps of one or none. It is not only possible, but probable, that in the second stage the produce of two copies should be more numerous than that of the other three, and thus already some readings which had a majority in their favour in the first stage would now be found only in a minority. At every stage the same kind of thing would happen, and the presumption in favour of the majority of so-called witnesses would rapidly diminish. The vast majority of MSS. would not improbably be the descendants of a few early copies which happened to be in a locality where the demand was greatest. Some early copies might disappear without leaving any successors, and yet these might have been the only witnesses to some genuine readings.

So far we have supposed the first copies to be all of equal value, and those in the next stage to be faithfully copied from them. Of course neither supposition is correct. The second copies would introduce errors of their own, not only in new places, but sometimes where there was already variation. The first copies themselves would not be equally correct, and it would be a mere chance whether the most correct or the least correct would become the source of the greatest number of copies. This would depend on wholly different circumstances of local convenience and local demand. It would not be until copies began to be pretty numerous in the same place that scribes would have the opportunity of

com  
mad  
com  
can  
we  
copy  
or f  
man  
Heb  
mar  
long  
MSS  
true  
the p  
I  
are s  
comp  
ques  
tion  
consi  
degre  
Noth  
the p  
which  
early  
as a h  
T  
presen  
ing M  
six M  
the m  
by v.  
'they  
be qui  
that o  
severa  
Ze  
all the  
read '  
Psa  
Englis  
'I hav



comparing different copies, or that any distinction would be made between the better and the worse. When the epoch of comparison arrived corrections might be made, of which we can only say that they would be made on principles which we should not consider sound. Thereafter some corrected copy might obtain reputation from the name of the reviser, or for other reasons, and would influence by its readings many others not directly taken from it. Thus there are some Hebrew codices of great repute referred to by name in the margin of many existing MSS.<sup>1</sup>

It will be seen that after this epoch of correction, if not long before, the presumption that the reading of a majority of MSS. was the reading of a majority of the first copies, the true 'witnesses,' would have ceased to exist, and *a fortiori* the presumption that it was the reading of the original.

It follows that all readings known to be equally ancient are so far entitled to equal consideration. In the case of comparatively recent MSS., such as the Hebrew, when it is a question whether a particular reading is a mistake or invention of a recent scribe, number is of importance, and the same consideration applies to older authorities, though in a less degree in proportion as they approach nearer to the original. Nothing is required to give a reading a *locus standi* except the proof that it actually existed in the earliest period to which we can trace the history of the text. Now a single early MS. or a single version might prove this as effectively as a hundred late copies.

There are a few instances in which the genuine reading is preserved by a minority, sometimes a small minority, of existing MSS. Thus in Joshua ix. 4, already mentioned, about six MSS. have the correct reading. (The Revisers give it in the margin.) This, however, may be a correction suggested by v. 12, perhaps also by the Targum. In Jeremiah xlix. 23, 'they are faint-hearted; there is sorrow on the sea; it cannot be quiet,' the correct reading is probably 'with unrest like that of the sea which cannot be quiet,' which is the reading of several MSS.

Zechariah xiv. 5: 'The Lord thy God shall come, and all the holy ones with thee.' Many MSS. (with the Versions) read 'with him,' which the sense requires.

Psalms xvi. 2: 'Thou hast said unto the Lord,' where the English Version supplies 'O my soul.' Twenty-two MSS. have 'I have said,' which is certainly the true reading, and is

<sup>1</sup> These codices are not older than the seventh century.

moreover that of the Versions. It is adopted by the Revised Version.

Psalms lix. 9: 'His strength I will wait upon thee.' A. V. prefixes 'because of,' but even this fails to make a reasonable sense. Ten MSS. with the Versions read: 'Upon thee, O my strength, will I wait.' The Revisers have rightly adopted this also.

Isaiah xxvii. 2: 'Sing ye unto her, A vineyard of red-wine.' Read with some MSS. (as in the Revisers' margin), 'A vineyard of pleasure.' The difference is that between D and R before referred to.

Jeremiah v. 7: 'Fed them to the full,' Authorized Version, is an emendation. The Massoretic text has 'made them to swear.'

Other instances might be given, but when the number of MSS. is small, there must always be a doubt whether the reading has not been suggested by some of the Versions, especially the Targums, or by a parallel passage where it exists.

There is one element of the Massoretic text which is admittedly of no authority—namely, all that belongs to the vocalization, punctuation (or accentuation), and division of words. As a system no doubt the vocalization rests on a sound tradition, but this fact does not warrant us in assuming its correctness in any individual instance. The vowels and accents, in short, embody the exegesis as well as the pronunciation of the punctuators. If we possessed a commentary by the ablest Hebraist of the seventh century we should yield to his opinions just that respect which his learning and sagacity commanded; no one would dream of rejecting a well-supported interpretation simply because it was opposed to the views of this learned Rabbi, or even of many such Rabbis. Yet we frequently find commentators alleging as a serious objection to some rendering that it violates the vowel-points or the accents. One fact alone is sufficient to destroy the authority of the accentuation. It is that the superscription of some of the Psalms is treated as part of the first verse (for example, Pss. xxiii., xxiv., xxv., cix., cxxxix.; 'and he said' in Ps. xviii.). The word 'Selah,' also, is closely connected with the words preceding, as in Pss. ix. 19; xx. 3, 'And thy burnt sacrifice, accept selah;' xxi. 2, 'And the request of his lips, thou hast not withholden selah.'

We might adduce many instances in which modern exegesis departs from that indicated by the accents. One may suffice: Isaiah ix. 6 (5 in the Hebrew text) reads, according to the

point  
the  
Prin

T

prova

listen

irrati

Gree

punct

O

G

'Gad,

[their

shall

italics

sense,

is four

feres v

of eac

confus

word

right.

An

Jerem

priest,

then s

you of

words

are th

senses

Not o

existin

are rig

Psa

Revis

but the

last—r

'They

It i

Ps. xli

'my G

merely

belongs

pointing and accents, as follows: 'The Wonderful Counsellor the Mighty God shall call his name, Everlasting Father Prince of Peace.'

The maxim of Aben Ezra, quoted apparently with approval by some moderns, that no interpretation is to be listened to which violates the accents, is not a whit less irrational than it would be to say that no interpretation of the Greek Testament should be listened to which violates the punctuation of Stephens' text.

One or two wrong divisions of words may be mentioned:—

Genesis xlix. 19, 20 reads thus in the Revised Version: 'Gad, a troop shall press upon him: but he shall press upon [their] heel. Out of Asher his bread shall be fat, and he shall yield royal dainties.' The word 'their' ought to be in italics; it is not in the original. But it is indispensable to the sense, and the single letter which is required to express it is found at the beginning of verse 20, where it not only interferes with the uniformity of arrangement by which the name of each tribe stands first in the blessing, but, what is worse, confuses the sense. By simply attaching the letter to the last word of verse 19 everything is made correct. The LXX is right.

Another instance which we regard as certain occurs in Jeremiah xxiii. 33: 'When this people, or the prophet, or a priest, shall ask thee saying, What is the burden of Jehovah? then shalt thou say unto them, What burden? and I will cast you off, saith Jehovah.' A simple change in the division of words makes this read: 'Then shalt thou say unto them, Ye are the burden, and I will cast you off,' a play on the two senses of the word 'burden,' such as occurs again in verse 36. Not only do we thus get a better sense, but, in fact, the existing text is ungrammatical. The Septuagint and Vulgate are right.

Psalms lxixiii. 4 reads thus in Authorized Version (and in Revised Version): 'For there are no bands in their death: but their strength is firm.' A change even slighter than the last—namely, dividing one word into two—gives us the sense: 'They have no tortures: perfect and firm is their strength.'<sup>1</sup>

It is scarcely necessary to recall to the mind of the reader Ps. xlii. 5, 6, where the only question is whether the word 'my God,' which certainly belongs to the end of verse 5, has merely dropped out before the same word in verse 6, or belongs to verse 5 only. The latter view is adopted by most

<sup>1</sup> This emendation was first proposed by Moerlius in 1737.

commentators, and has the support of the Septuagint, Syriac, and Vulgate, besides a few Hebrew MSS., which perhaps some may think more important. The reader who is unacquainted with Hebrew may require to be told that 'his countenance' consists of the same letters as 'my countenance and.' Even if the Versions were silent, the emendation would be certain.

In Amos vi. 12 we read: 'Shall horses run upon the rock? Will one plow [there] with oxen?' The word 'there' is an insertion of the translators. A separation of what is now one word into two gives us 'Will one plow the sea with oxen?'

Of errors in the vowel points we shall now give a few specimens:—

1 Kings xiii. 12: 'And their father said unto them, What way went he? For his sons had seen what way the man of God went which came from Judah. And he said unto his sons, Saddle me the ass.' As the text stands, nothing is said of the answer to the question, while a perfectly superfluous remark appears instead. What is worse, the rules of Hebrew syntax are violated by the present text. A change in the vowels gives us, 'And his sons showed him what way,' &c. This is also the reading of the LXX, the Syriac, and Vulgate. It is in the Revisers' margin.

Isaiah xvi. 4: 'Let mine outcasts dwell with thee, Moab.' The context shows that the outcasts of Moab are spoken of: 'Let the outcasts of Moab dwell with thee.' So the Sept., Syriac, and Targum.

Job xxxiv. 17, 18, 19, reads in the Authorized Version: 'Wilt thou condemn him that is most just? *Is it fit to say to a king, Thou art wicked? and to princes, Ye are ungodly? How much less to him that accepteth not the person of princes,*' &c. A text which requires to be supplemented in this fashion is probably wrong. Now a change of points gives us in verse 18, 'That saith to a king, Wicked! and to princes, Ungodly!' (as in margin of Revised Version). Thus the whole passage is coherent, and no supplement is required to complete the sense.

In Job iii. 6 the Authorized Version departs from the vowel points, reading 'Let it not be joined unto the days of the year,' the Massoretic text being 'Let it not rejoice among the days.' Opinions may differ as to the correctness of this emendation. The Revised Version follows the Massoretic text.

As we have already given illustrations of the help to be obtained from the Versions in confirming emendations other-

1887  
wise  
sion  
erro  
Syri  
with  
brin  
I  
taine  
The  
'stro  
us to  
hono  
ness.  
riches  
T  
lowin  
bring  
seeke  
the m  
peace.  
unto  
seek o  
peace.  
by ho  
tion, n  
the Lo  
sion h  
Vulgat  
fore ha  
iniquity  
Israel,  
Thumm  
as of th  
is easily  
whereas  
as the M  
between  
translat  
that fre  
simply r  
Job  
words of  
this: 'I  
my nece  
VOL. 2

wise suggested, we shall give a few instances in which omissions, &c., in the Hebrew text are supplied by the Versions.

Proverbs x. 10 has been referred to as an example of erroneous repetition in the second clause. The Sept. and Syriac supply the genuine second clause: 'He that winketh with the eye causeth sorrow; but he that rebuketh boldly bringeth peace.' (So the margin of Revised Version.)

Proverbs xi. 16: 'A gracious woman obtaineth (*or* retaineth) honour, and the violent obtain (*or* retain) riches.' The word here rendered 'violent' is rendered by the A. V. 'strong,' but is not used in a good sense. The LXX enable us to restore the text thus: 'A gracious woman obtaineth honour; but a seat of shame is a woman that hates righteousness. Indolence will lack wealth, but the diligent retain riches.'

These are no inventions of the translator, nor is the following (2 Sam. xvii. 3). The A. V. reads: 'And I will bring back all the people unto thee; the man whom thou seekest is as if all returned (literally: as the return of all the man whom thou seekest) *so* all the people shall be in peace.' The LXX gives: 'I will bring back all the people unto thee as a bride returneth to her husband; thou shalt seek only the life of one man, and all the people shall be in peace.' The omission in the Hebrew is easily accounted for by homœoteleuton. Nor can the following be an invention, 1 Sam. xiv. 41. The A. V. reads: 'Saul said unto the Lord God of Israel, Give a perfect *lot*.' Revised Version has: 'Show the right.' The LXX (confirmed by the Vulgate) reads: 'Saul said, O Lord God of Israel, Wherefore hast thou not answered thy servant this day? If the iniquity be in me or in Jonathan my son, O Lord God of Israel, give Urim, and if it be in thy people Israel, give Thummim.' The letters of 'give Thummim' are the same as of the words rendered 'give a perfect *lot*.' The omission is easily accounted for by homœoteleuton (Israel . . . Israel); whereas the interpolation of the words would be inexplicable, as the Massoretic text nowhere gives a hint of this distinction between the responses of Urim and Thummim. Moreover the translator of the books of Samuel is so averse from conjecture that frequently when the word before him was obscure he has simply reproduced it in Greek letters.

Job xxiii. 12 reads in the Hebrew: 'I have hidden the words of his mouth more than my law.' The A. V. renders this: 'I have esteemed the words of his mouth more than my necessary *food*.' The Revised Version merely substitutes

'treasured up' for 'esteemed,' and in the margin suggests for the last three words 'my own law.' None of these renderings can be considered satisfactory. Now the consonants of 'law' and 'bosom' are the same, and by simply reading B for M as the prefix preposition the LXX and Vulgate give the excellent sense: 'I have hidden in my bosom the words of his mouth.'

Job xxvii. 18: 'He buildeth his house as a moth, and as a booth which the keeper maketh.' The moth does not build houses. A letter has dropped out and the true reading is 'spider,' which has the support of the LXX and the Syriac.

Psalms xxxvi. 1 is translated as follows in the A. V. 'The transgression of the wicked saith within my heart *that there is* no fear of God before his eyes.' The word rendered 'saith' means 'an oracle,' 'effatum.' The literal rendering is 'An oracle of transgression to the wicked within my heart,' &c. This is, to say the least, impossible. The Syriac and Jerome give 'his heart.' The correction is the slightest possible, the difference between 'his' and 'my' being only that between Vav and Yod, and the confusion between these two letters being extremely frequent. Three MSS. also read 'his,' but the number is too small to be attributed to a correct tradition.

The last we shall note is Micah i. 6: 'What is the transgression of Jacob? *is it* not Samaria? and what the high places of Judah? *are they* not Jerusalem?' The Septuagint, Syriac, and Targum read for 'high places' 'sin,' as the sense obviously requires. These three witnesses are decisive.

We have said nothing of the use of the Septuagint by the writers of the New Testament. Yet in the minds of many it is not unimportant that S. James appeals to the Greek version of Amos ix. 12, which differs considerably from the Hebrew in sense ('that the residue of men may seek after the Lord' instead of 'that they may possess the remnant of Edom'). It is easy to restore the Hebrew text corresponding to the former version, and it differs very slightly in letters from the received.

S. Paul also (Gal. iii. 10) cites Deut. xxvi. 27, with the important word 'all,' which is not in the Massoretic text, although it is in the English Version.

It is singular that some writers who refuse to accept the Versions as evidence for a reading, yet lay stress on their renderings as evidence of the meaning of the original. This is the same thing as refusing to admit a witness's testimony to a fact and accepting his opinion as evidence.



In connexion with our English Version it is worth while remembering that the only truly Authorized Version of the Psalms, the Prayer-Book version, is lineally descended from the LXX, and that, too, in an unrevised text. Thus in the 14th Psalm several verses are added which not only are not in the Hebrew, but form no part of the genuine text of the LXX. In another very important particular the Authorized Version follows the LXX, viz. in the order of the books. If the Revisers had returned to the order of the Hebrew and placed the Hagiographa with a separate title after the other books the rearrangement would have led the intelligent reader to make some interesting inquiries.

It may be conceded that the LXX make more mistakes in single letters, such as D and R, than the Massoretic text. Probably the MS. they used was sometimes difficult to read. It has already been remarked that there are differences in the character of the LXX version of different books. The Massoretic text also is more correct in some books than in others. In the Book of Samuel, for instance, it is very incorrect, not only in particular readings, but in consequence of omissions and interpolations. In the Book of Jeremiah also there are frequent interpolations. It must be remembered that the books composing the Old Testament must have been separately copied, some of them frequently, before they made part of the larger collection. Most even of our modern MSS. contain only the Pentateuch, or the Prophets ('earlier' or 'later'), or the Hagiographa. It must have been more rare in earlier times to find these parts united in one volume. And before these smaller collections were made, each of their components must have been copied separately. The several Psalms were doubtless copied more than once before their collection into the five books which subsequently were again combined in one volume. Thus the text of some Psalms has clearly become more corrupt than that of others. But we must not dwell further on this.

We have not aimed at bringing forward new suggestions; it was more proper for our purpose to adduce only that which was certain or nearly so. The general conclusion is that the Massoretic text contains errors as many and various as might have been expected in a text with such a history. And we infer that the exegete need have no hesitation in correcting palpable errors. The duty of a translator is somewhat different; but when a reading in itself preferable has the support of the Versions the translator also is justified in adopting it, if not indeed rather bound to do so.

### ART. III.—CONVOCATION, DIVORCE, AND THE POWER OF THE KEYS.

1. *Report of a Committee of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury on an Articulus Cleri of the Lower House on the Subject of Divorce.* *Guardian*, July 15, 1885.
2. *Chronicle of Convocation*, No. 1. (1885.)
3. *Marriage Laws of the United States, and their Results.* (London, 1885.)
4. *An Argument for the Indissolubility of Marriage.* By JOHN KEBLE. (London, 1857.)
5. *A Sequel to the Argument.* By the same. (London, 1857.)
6. *Speech of Baron von Gerlach in the Prussian Chamber on the Marriage Law.* (London, 1857.)
7. *Considerations on Divorce à Vinculo Matrimonii, in connexion with Holy Scripture.* By a Barrister. (London, 1857.)
8. *The Increase of Immorality and the Abeyance of Church Discipline.* By J. B. SWEET. (London, 1885.)
9. *The Penitential Discipline of the Primitive Church.* By N. MARSHALL. Lib. Ang.-Cath. Theol. (London, 1844.)
10. *Comber on Excommunication.* (London, 1685.)

SIX years ago<sup>1</sup> in an article on 'Christian Marriage,' we took occasion to vindicate the sanctity of the holy estate of matrimony from the outrages inflicted on it by divorce, and by incestuous unions within the prohibited degrees. The subject is one of such vital importance to the welfare of the individual, of the family, and of the State, that we do not hesitate to recur to it. So far as that article covers the same ground as the present one, it is in entire accord with it, and lends it strong support. But we now have to consider a proposal for remedial action by the Church which it is needless to say effects a very considerable change in the standpoint from which the question has to be regarded.

On February 12, 1885, the Lower House of the Convocation of Canterbury presented to the Upper House the following *articulus cleri*:—

'The Lower House respectfully represents—

'1. That previous to the year 1857 no power to grant divorces, *à vinculo matrimonii*, so as to allow of subsequent remarriage of the

<sup>1</sup> See the *Church Quarterly Review* for April 1881.

divorced parties, was claimed or exercised either by the ecclesiastical or by the civil courts of this realm.

'2. That in the years 1857, 1868, and 1873 Acts of Parliament were passed, facilitating divorce and legalizing such remarriage.

'3. That since the passing of these Acts every year sees an increase in the number of divorces; so that whereas between 1857 and 1877 the decrees made absolute amounted to an average of 163 per annum, in the year 1879 358 decrees of dissolution were made absolute.

'4. That, consequently, questions of extreme difficulty are from time to time, and in increasing number, presented to the clergy and people, in which are involved the granting or withholding of the Church's ministrations in the case of persons who, being declared by the decree of the Civil Court to be set free *à vinculo matrimonii*, desire to contract fresh marriages; and further the admission of such persons, after such new contract, to the Holy Communion.

'5. That to commit the solution of questions of this nature to the unaided discretion of individual clergymen is to them a matter of great hardship, and to the Church a source of danger and discredit.

'6. That an authoritative declaration by the Church on these and such-like points is, moreover, due to her members; who, without such guidance, might unwittingly, and in good faith, contract alliances which they would afterwards learn to be contrary to the law of the Church.

'This House, therefore, humbly prays their Lordships of the Upper House to take into their consideration this subject, with a view to the putting forth of a synodical declaration on the law of the Church with respect to marriage, and thus preventing breaches of the law of the Church through ignorance of what that law is.'

No time was lost by the Bishops in dealing with this petition. A committee was at once appointed to consider it and to report. They reported in the following July; and their Report forms No. 1 of the works cited at the head of this article. Their lordships stand therefore clear of any charge of indifference or wilful delay in responding to the prayer of the representatives of the parochial clergy; but, inasmuch as a somewhat similar effort made so far back as February 1872<sup>1</sup> failed to secure the attention of the then president and his comprovincials, and as well-nigh two years have elapsed since the presentation of this Report without any action being taken thereon, we may be excused for offering such extraneous aid as we can give to prevent another abortive issue and further folding of hands, amid the unchecked progress of demoralization.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> See *Chronicle of Convocation* for February 1872.

<sup>2</sup> As long ago as 1857 Mr. Keble wrote regretfully that whilst there are 'few questions more important morally, socially, or doctrinally, there

Of the Report itself and its recommendations we will speak further on. Our more immediate purpose is to illustrate (1) the enormous importance of its subject, (2) the obligation which presses on the Church to deal with it immediately, and (3) the fact that the only remedy proper to herself, or appropriate to the evil complained of, is precisely of the *nature* which the Report suggests.

I. The vast importance of the subject of divorce and of the laws which regulate it arises partly from its bearing on society or the State, partly from its bearing on the Christian doctrine and rite of holy matrimony, and partly from its bearing on individual souls. We will say something on each of these points.

(a) As to its bearing on society or the State, no one who accepts the Scriptural account of the creation of our first parents can fail to trace society to its origin in holy matrimony, or to perceive that God willed the family to be at once the embryo and the basis of the State.<sup>1</sup> And this being so, he will conclude that whatever tends to loosen the marriage tie, and to undermine the structure and functions of the family, is opposed to the national welfare, and will, if unchecked, destroy it. Now, no argument can be needed to show that divorce *à vinculo* does both these things in the most formal and undisguised manner. It is not, therefore, necessarily as a transgression of Divine law that such divorce should be abhorred and restrained; but as striking at the root of the social system, as inimical to civil progress, as opposed to loyalty and order, as fatal to the conservative influences of

are very few in which those who are most concerned have hitherto appeared to take so little interest' as divorce (*An Argument*, &c., pp. 43, 44). What would he have said to-day if, after twenty years of revived synodal action, the subject were simply taken up to be dropped again forthwith?

<sup>1</sup> *Importance of the Family*.—'As the original mould in which all human life is cast, and within which authority blending with love first touches the will and lays the foundation of character, the family, not the individual, is the true unit of society and of the Church. As such both reason and revelation require us to treat it. Unfortunately for it, and for the Church and the nation, we have not done so. Overmastered or beguiled by the spirit of the age, we have drifted out passively on the current of individualism, until we are now called to face the consequences of a wrong theory and a worse practice touching the very source of the strongest formative elements of the Church and of the State. That household religion and morality have changed, and are still changing, for the worse, is recognized by all Christian people as one of the dark omens of the time.'—*Pastoral Letter of Thirty-two American Bishops*, issued at the recent triennial convention at Chicago.

fam  
by r  
brea

and  
pag  
and  
tem  
not  
the  
the  
thin  
The  
were  
creas  
Sena  
state  
be re

A  
why  
whil  
the r  
the f  
the s  
men  
where  
cheris  
a sac

<sup>1</sup> E  
cannot  
Huxley  
Scienc  
this or  
but in  
social  
physic  
1886).

<sup>2</sup> F  
von G  
Modest  
'Conso

<sup>3</sup> I  
<sup>4</sup> N  
unfavour  
once in  
only fro  
duced  
for sepa

family life, and as endangering all the securities and compacts by which society is held together. It pollutes the individual, breaks up the household, and undermines the State.<sup>1</sup>

This peril to national welfare from contempt of marriage and loss of family life has been accordingly exemplified in pagan as well as Christian States. Witness ancient Rome and modern France. The elements of Roman greatness (her temperance, fortitude, discipline, justice, and patriotism) were not gathered in the voluptuous days of the empire, but in the days when Greek vice had not yet contaminated both the Senate and the people; when 'family life was a sacred thing, and for 520 years divorce was unknown among them.'<sup>2</sup> The elements of Rome's decline and fall, on the contrary, were already ingathered when (B.C. 151), amid an ever-increasing flood of licentiousness and vice, her once pure-minded Senators could listen without a dissentient voice to the vile statement of the censor Metellus that 'marriage could only be regarded as an intolerable necessity.'<sup>3</sup>

And whence the restlessness of modern France? And why are her great cities rife with atheism and revolution, whilst the sole conservative elements of society are found in the rural population of her provinces? Is it not because in the former, the sacred bond of matrimony is habitually defied,<sup>4</sup> the sense of home and of parental responsibility is impaired, men live in the streets, and the discipline of family life is lost; whereas in the latter, the landowners and peasantry alike still cherish the feeling of earlier days, hold marriage in respect as a sacramental rite, and retain those traditions of family life

<sup>1</sup> Even the zealots of physical science perceive this, though they cannot perceive that an overruling Mind orders it. Thus Professor Huxley, writing on 'Science and Morals' in a recent *Fortnightly*, says, Science 'knows that the safety of morality lies neither in the adoption of this or that philosophical speculation, or of this or that theological creed, but in a real and living belief in that fixed order of nature which sends social disorganization upon the track of immorality, as surely as it sends physical disease after physical trespasses' (quoted in *Guardian*, Dec. 15, 1886).

<sup>2</sup> Farrar's *Early Days of Christianity*, vol. i. p. 7, 3rd ed. Baron von Gerlach quotes a definition of marriage by the Roman lawyer Modestinus which would have done honour to a Christian Father—'Consortium omnis vitæ, divini humanique juris communicatio.'

<sup>3</sup> *Id. ibid.* p. 11, B.C. 151.

<sup>4</sup> Not as yet chiefly by divorce, for until lately French law was rather unfavourable to divorce; but by concubinage and other kindred vices at once immoral and unnatural. The present divorce law of France dates only from 1884; but within the first five months of its existence it produced 1,773 petitions for divorce *à vinculo*, and a total of 3,666 petitions for separation *à mensâ et toro*.

which make it the nursery of faith and the cradle of loyalty? Such at least was the conclusion of the distinguished officer who was specially appointed to investigate and report on the causes of the collapse of the French army in the Franco-German war. For, tracing that collapse, secondarily, to the absence of discipline, patriotism, and *esprit de corps*, he pointed to its primary source in the void of religious faith and family affection amid the great masses of the people. 'They have neither altars nor homes,' he said. 'Not having these, they have comparatively little to defend; and the ancient rallying cry, the sure presage of victory, *Pro aris et focis!* for the modern French soldiery has no meaning.'<sup>1</sup>

Nothing, in short, can be more true than the following utterances of Baron von Gerlach (himself a judge in matrimonial causes for forty years) in the famous speech addressed by him to the Prussian Chamber of Deputies in 1857, in favour of largely reducing the legal pleas for a divorce:—

'How can the oath which we have taken to our king be held sacred by us if we profane the oath which we made at the altar of God?

'The breach of the marriage vow is a breach of faithfulness and an act of perjury.

'Nothing can be binding on us when we no longer feel ourselves bound by this tie of marriage.

'All authority is destroyed when this is broken down.

'Loosen the marriage tie and you sanction every revolutionary principle.'

(*b*) The importance of the subject of divorce, and of the laws which regulate it, is further seen in their bearing on the Christian rite and doctrine of holy matrimony; for divorce *à vinculo* discredits and does violence to both. Taking the Christian doctrine of marriage first, and deferring for a time a statement of the various grounds upon which it rests, we will content ourselves at present with reminding the reader that when Mr. Keble had carefully examined all the witnesses of that doctrine from St. Paul to Origen, with Dr. Pusey's different inference from Tertullian and others immediately and avowedly before him, he summarized the evidence in the following words:—<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> We give this report from memory, but are clear as to its essential accuracy.

<sup>2</sup> See *Sequel*, pp. 16-21, and note O, p. 431, of 'Tertullian,' vol. i., *Library of the Fathers*. Mr. Keble's inquiry, it need hardly be said, extended through the whole period of Church history down to the last century.



'These indications of the mind of the three first ages of the Church may fitly be summed up in the words of the 47th Apostolical canon, one of that collection which, by consent of our greatest divines, was generally received before Constantine, at least in the Oriental Churches, and is recognized in the authentic remains of every one of the four Great Councils which the State as well as the Church of England acknowledges. The words of that canon are, "If any layman, having put away his own wife, shall take another, or one divorced by another man, let him be excommunicated."<sup>1</sup>

Accepting this canon as a fair interpretation of the Christian doctrine of marriage in the Church's purest days, we are constrained to brand as anti-Christian whatever authorizes divorce *à vinculo* and gives licence to remarry during the lifetime of both parties. And since the divorce law even of England does this we condemn it unreservedly as opposed to the law of Christ.

Nor is the antagonism of divorce *à vinculo* less direct as against the whole tone and language of the Church's rite and office of holy matrimony; for, to take our own as an example,<sup>2</sup> the ancient key-note of the office is the Lord's own warning, 'What God hath joined together let not man put asunder.' 'So long as ye both shall live' is the only term of

<sup>1</sup> Εἰ τις λαϊκὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐκβάλλων, ἑτέραν λάβῃ, ἢ παρ' ἄλλου ἀπολελυμένην, ἀφοριέσθω (*Sequel*, p. 27). The extent of collusion between husband and wife to procure a divorce for ulterior designs, proves plainly the wisdom of such an absolute prohibition, and our own need of it; for, despite Queen's proctors, it has been authoritatively stated that collusion is at the bottom of an immense majority of suits for divorce in the English court; whilst the Governor of Connecticut, in his message to the Legislature in June 1880, states that eight out of ten divorces were granted in the court of that State on *uncontested* hearings, and that this was indication of collusion.—*Marriage Laws*, &c., p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> 'Substantially the old Latin service, subjected to a certain amount of rearrangement and alteration' (S.P.C.K. *Commentary*). 'As things have hitherto stood we of the Reformed English Church, whatever our shortcomings in some respects, have been bound to thank God for this among other privileges, that the Gospel law of marriage does, by God's mercy, exist among us more exactly such as it was left by the Apostles than it is found in the other great portions of Christendom; for while both Greece and Rome have extended their prohibitions of marriage far beyond all warrant of Scripture or antiquity, and while Greece, moreover, to a great degree has surrendered the doctrine of the indissolubility, and Rome has been over-bold in her claims of dispensation, and the Reformed elsewhere have accepted the principle of divorce, the English Church ever since the Reformation has been providentially led by two broad Scriptural rules—the one as to the prohibited degrees ("None of you shall approach to anyone near of kin to him"), the other as to divorce ("What God hath joined together let not man put asunder"); both, again, depending on the primitive decree in Paradise, "They are no more twain, but one flesh."—*Sequel*, p. 218.

the bond proposed for the acceptance of bride and bridegroom equally, by the officiating priest. The one pledge of matrimonial fidelity, given separately by each party with joined hands, runs in these words: 'till death us do part, according to God's holy ordinance.' God is, moreover, addressed as having so knit them together that it 'never should be lawful to put them asunder,' and as having consecrated the state of matrimony to 'represent the spiritual marriage and unity between Christ and His Church.'<sup>1</sup>

Now, by the action of any form of law which permits divorce *à vinculo* all this is set aside. Christian doctrine, order, and covenant are alike outraged and ignored; and wedlock, as has been said, becomes wed-loose, to the dishonour of Christ, the destruction of the family, the ultimate ruin of States, and the joy of those only who 'in their hearts say there is no God.' Of the deep and vital interest of Churchmen in checking divorce, and of the important bearing of divorce laws on their belief, there can, therefore, be no question. The importance of our subject to them at least can scarcely be overrated.

(c) But its gravity and claims on our attention may be still further illustrated by the consideration that the everlasting happiness or misery of millions, both at home and in our foreign dependencies and colonies, may depend on our own promptness or delay in counteracting, repealing, or modifying the existing law. For so long as a possibility of obtaining a divorce *à vinculo* exists (which on every ground of logic must carry with it licence to remarry), so long there will exist the highest possible incentive to the indulgence of carnal lust,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Such being the tone of our order of matrimony, Mr. Keble did not hesitate to say that the English clergy are *sworn* to maintain the indissolubility of valid marriage. 'It is at the Church's own peril, and especially is it at the peril of those who are ordained and sworn to be the ministers of her discipline—it is at the peril of the priests and bishops especially—whether or no they will maintain the law of the indissolubility of marriage, which in our ordination as priests we all *swore* to maintain. I say it with all deference, but quite advisedly; we *swore* to maintain it; for that indissolubility, as taught in the Prayer Book and provided for in the canons, is, as much as anything else, part of the "discipline of Christ" as this Church and realm hath received the same. Such it is at this moment, and such it will continue until the Church herself in Council see fit to alter it; for the word "Church" in the above-mentioned sentence is not swallowed up by the word "realm."—*Sequel*, pp. 216-7.

<sup>2</sup> What has been said of the extent of collusion indicates this, but statistics of petitions for divorce, hereinafter to be quoted, will place it beyond question. A Report presented to the recent Convention at Chicago by three bishops, three canonists, and three jurists, ascribed the increasing demand for divorce, not to the laws which grant it, but to the

and  
in i  
kind  
list  
in it  
Chu  
offer  
befo

vinc  
Chu  
exan  
of d  
prof  
dicti  
repe  
dorse  
her t

I  
secul  
the o  
witho  
H  
her o  
the '  
kinge  
misery  
failed  
results

<sup>1</sup> S  
time, g  
in his  
of date  
in this  
than 1  
of the  
commu  
they e  
mother  
ch. II,  
<sup>2</sup> F

clergy  
its tyra  
renegac  
so-calle  
plainly  
trude fo

<sup>3</sup> Se

and to the commission of that offence which (as summing up in itself all the worst elements of sensuality) represents all kindred vices in the sacred code; which also heads St. Paul's list of acts that exclude from heaven, and was held so heinous in itself, and so injurious to society by the Greek and African Churches of the fourth century, as to demand from the penitent offender no less than eighteen years of public humiliation before full readmission to the communion of the faithful.<sup>1</sup>

It must be an axiom, therefore, in dealing with divorce *à vinculo*, that God's blessing cannot rest on any portion of the Church which enters into *compromises* regarding it—such, for example, as allowing State enactments to impede her exercise of discipline upon her lapsed members, or consenting to the profanation of her sanctuaries by opening them for the benediction of the *perjured*<sup>2</sup>—for by so doing she would practically repeal the Seventh Commandment, encourage deadly sin, endorse the violation of her own terms of membership, abandon her trust, and vacate her office.

II. So much as to the importance of divorce, both in a secular and a religious point of view. We proceed to illustrate the obligation which presses upon the Church to deal with it without delay.

Her obligation to deal with it *at all* arises, of course, from her office as 'Pillar and Stay of the Truth,' her mission to be the 'salt of the earth,' and her trusteeship of the 'keys of the kingdom.'<sup>3</sup> Her obligation to deal with it *forthwith* arises misery resulting from ill-assorted and hastily contracted marriages. They failed to see that this very ill-assortment and haste are themselves the results of the laws which give facilities for dissolution of marriage.

<sup>1</sup> See the epistle of St. Gregory Nyssen to Letoïus, Bishop of Melitine, given (in the original Greek) by the present Bishop of St. Andrew's in his very valuable appendix to a Sermon on Evangelical Repentance, of date 1842. There was nothing new, or peculiar to the fourth century, in this view of the sin of adultery and its proper penance; for no less than 150 years earlier, Tertullian, no partial witness, admitted the rigour of the Church's code in these words: 'They sit—the confessed and ex-communicate adulterers—in sackcloth; they are covered with ashes; they entreat with sighs and groans and bended knees their common mother,' &c. &c. (*De Pudicit.*, ch. v. 13; see also Bingham, *Antiq.*, book xvi. ch. 11, on the ancient provision against fornication, adultery, and incest).

<sup>2</sup> Far too much has been made of the State's concession that a clergyman may refuse to marry a guilty divorcee, and far too little of its tyrannical imposition of a heavy penalty if he refuse to allow some renegade brother to do so in his church, or if he refuse to remarry the so-called innocent party in the other's lifetime. And it cannot be too plainly stated that none but the most worthless of their class would intrude for such a purpose.

<sup>3</sup> See references and explanations given below.

especially from the rapidity with which the evil in question multiplies, and the demand, when once admitted, increases. For its indulgence, instead of satiating, quickens the vicious appetite; and the wider the legal opening for its gratification, the higher will rise the tide of lust which rushes in to escape by it from all the restraints of decency and honour.

Unhappily we need go no further than our own case, and the case of our kinsmen in America, to prove this. But we may be allowed first of all to refer to the case of Germany as sketched in No. 6 of the works at the head of this article; although the statistics there given are not comparative, and are of no later date than 1857; for they illustrate the tendency and danger of which we speak, by the contrast they offer between the position of the adulterer in the last century and his position now; whilst they also confirm what we have said touching the difference in extent of demoralization, and contempt of marriage, between rural and urban populations.

In North Germany adultery had long been a *capital offence*; but the relaxed principles of the eighteenth century, which culminated in the French Revolution, carried her into the opposite extreme; and the marriage laws in force in 1857 were due to the boasted *enlightenment* of that earlier period, and were based on the absolutely false idea of the utilitarians that liberty of divorce would prove more favourable to increase of population than fidelity to the marriage vow. They admitted, and we believe still admit, in place of the supposed one plea of St. Matthew's Gospel for separation, no less than *eleven* pleas<sup>1</sup> for dissolution of marriage; and their effect upon the lower classes, and especially upon women, is declared by one who, as we have seen, for forty years administered them, and made many vain efforts to improve them, to be desolating and calamitous. The very legislators were too demoralized to consent to their repeal or modification; and Baron von Gerlach's masterly oration is a standing witness that when professedly Christian people have

<sup>1</sup> Grounds of divorce allowed by the Prussian State laws:—1. Adultery and unnatural crimes. 2. Desertion. 3. Refusal of marital rights. 4. Impotence. 5. Raging madness or insanity. 6. Attempts against life, gross ill-treatment, repeated false and defamatory accusations, dangerous quarrelsomeness. 7. Acts of felony or false accusations of such acts, disreputable occupation. 8. Disorderly manner of life. 9. Continued refusal of maintenance by the husband. 10. Giving up the Christian religion. 11. Unconquerable aversion, or mutual consent to separate where there are no children, or exceptionally where there are children. (No. 6, Preface.)

read  
on t

num  
a da  
diss  
ally  
by t  
the  
ther  
how  
Rhe  
inha  
Berl  
No v  
Drum  
rema  
riage

V  
about  
to i  
Long  
'The  
prese  
The  
raliza  
invol  
able.  
Thus  
forty-  
vorce  
in 18  
increa  
and c  
S  
364 in  
In  
1883,  
In

1 T  
States  
eight S  
whole  
we beli  
2 D

reached the stage of debasement at which such laws sit easily on their conscience, it is a case of *vestigia nulla retrorsum*.

Speaking apparently of Prussia only, he stated that 'the number of divorces every year amounts to about 3,000, or ten a day; and that if you allow three children to every marriage dissolved, this gives from 9,000 to 10,000 children to be *annually abandoned to the loss of parental care*, and demoralized by the example of parental guilt.' Again, he says, 'Between the years 1817 and 1822 for every 100,000 inhabitants of Prussia there were 987 new marriages and 27 divorces a year.' These, however, were very unequally distributed; for while in the Rhenish provinces divorces did not average 1 in every 100,000 inhabitants, there were in the district of Potsdam, to which Berlin belongs, 78 divorces to every 100,000 inhabitants yearly. No wonder that with these facts before him the late Henry Drummond, who translated the speech, prefaced it by the remark that 'in point of fact there is no such thing as marriage in Prussia.'

We turn now to the United States of America.<sup>1</sup> In or about 1805 Dr. Dwight deplored the proportion of 1 divorce to 100 marriages in Connecticut.<sup>2</sup> On June 20, 1883, the *London Morning Post* contained the following statement: 'The number of divorces in America, it is estimated, will at the present rate of increase equal that of marriages in twenty years.' The break-up of families, the virtual orphanage, the demoralization, perjury, cruelty, concubinage, abortion, and misery involved in this contrast of eighty years are simply unfathomable. Yet returns from individual States confirm the estimate. Thus to begin with Connecticut, which in 1849 (or within forty-five years from Dr. Dwight's lament) granted 91 divorces, or 1 to about 35 marriages, that single State granted in 1878 no less than 445, or 1 for every 10.4 marriages; the increase of divorces within thirty years being 389 per cent., and of population only 70.

San Francisco divorced 333 married couples in 1880, and 364 in 1881, equalling 1 divorce to every 5.78 marriages.

In Arapahoe County, Colorado, 197 divorces occurred in 1883, against 769 marriages, a proportion of 1 to 3.9.

In one year in twenty-nine of the fifty-two counties of

<sup>1</sup> The American civil law allows nine causes for divorce; and individual States add others, extending even to incompatibility of temper; and only eight States forbid remarriage in the lifetime of the other party. The whole number of pleas for divorce recognized in Europe or America is, we believe, twenty-two.

<sup>2</sup> Dwight's *Theology*, vol. iv. p. 267 (Tegg, London).

California there were 789 divorces to 5,849 marriage licences, or 1 to 7.41.

In Massachusetts (where the admitted causes of divorce are eight) the total ratio of divorces to marriages for twenty-one years, from 1860 to 1880, both inclusive, was 1 to 11.06.

And in seven out of ten of the counties comprised in the State of New Hampshire, containing 84 per cent. of the population, the divorces, which were 138 in 1870, were in 1873 201.<sup>1</sup>

Well may the narrator of these sad facts, and proofs of national degeneracy, add his protest against acquiescence in the superseding of Holy Scripture by civil law, and append his warning in strict accord with Baron von Gerlach's against all toleration of divorce *à vinculo*.

'Nothing,' he says, 'is more startling than to pass from the first part of the eighteenth century to this latter part of the nineteenth, and to observe how law has changed and opinion altered in regard to marriage—the great foundation of society—and divorce; and how almost *pari passu* various offences against chastity—such as concubinage, prostitution, illegitimate births, abortion, disinclination to family life—have increased also.'<sup>2</sup>

We take next our own case, and find it as regards the rapid increase of petitions for divorce to be only too similar to that of the United States. Nor is our outlook much brighter than theirs, despite our old traditions, our connexion of Church and State, and a reign of fifty years characterized by a moral purity at Court which has been seldom equalled.

Up to the year 1857 divorce *à vinculo* had been only granted by the Legislature. The Church gave it no sanction. The ecclesiastical courts allowed only a judicial separation from bed and board,<sup>3</sup> and took security against remarriage during the lifetime of both parties. The cases of dissolution of marriage by the Legislature averaged only three *per annum*. But *within two years* from the transfer of jurisdiction, in cases of divorce, from the Legislature to a special court their number had risen from 6 to 300: a fact sufficient to 'appal' the misguided author of the scheme, and to make him, as he himself recorded, 'stand aghast, like Frankenstein, at the monster he had called into existence.'<sup>4</sup>

The *articulus cleri* given above illustrates the same in-

<sup>1</sup> See No. 3 at the head of this article, pp. 3, 4, 14, 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 20.

<sup>3</sup> Reserving the right of declaring certain irregular marriages null and void *ab initio*. See Canons 105-7 of 1603.

<sup>4</sup> *Life of Lord Campbell*. An Irish M.P. and writer of modern his-



crease by the fact that whereas the yearly average of decrees made absolute for the twenty years from 1857 to 1877 was 163, they had risen in 1879 to 358. Again, the remarriage of divorced persons, which in the twenty-one years up to 1878 had reached a total of 107, were stated in 1885 to exceed 1,000. These are awful revelations; and the future of our country is inseparably bound up with them unless some potent check is put on this tendency of divorce to multiply—some remedy at once devised which shall vindicate and restore to honour the sacred rite of matrimony. But with every month lost the moral plague advances, and adultery here, as in America, comes to be viewed more and more as a mere escapade or *peccadillo*.<sup>1</sup> The latest returns from her Majesty's Divorce Court give the following results:—

The petitions there filed for nullity and for dissolution of marriage, which were the year before last respectively 10 and 390, were last year (ending October 31, 1886) no less than 15 and 575; besides petitions for judicial separation, amounting in the former year to 100, and in the latter to 133.<sup>2</sup> And still the horse leech cries 'Give, give,' and the debauched appetite demands further relaxations extending to unrestrained indulgence of sensual passion, and reducing wedlock to a mere contract of convenience terminable at will by either party. Such at least is part of the programme of the International Socialists; of whom, on Professor Rae's showing,<sup>3</sup> we are destined to hear far more, unless wise legislation on land and social questions deprives their agitation of popular sym-

tory concludes his notice of the changes wrought by Lord Campbell's Act with the remark that the use made of it by a grateful people is its practical justification. Would the hon. member maintain, as in consistency he ought, that if Lord Salisbury withdrew to-morrow all British opposition to the slave trade, and if the capture, sale, and exportation of Africans revived forthwith, the use made of such withdrawal by grateful slave hunters and dealers would practically justify it? And if not, why not? The apology is as good, or as bad, in the one case as the other.

<sup>1</sup> *Marriage Laws*, &c., p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Our information is authentic. The Tables of Demoralization published in the *Vanguard* of December 1886 show the total increase of petitions filed in the Divorce Court in the twenty-four years from 1861 to 1884 inclusive to be 440, the numbers being respectively 263 in 1861 and 703 in 1884. The significance of such figures will not be understood without recollection of the fact that the full influence of bad example in the classes which have hitherto furnished nine-tenths or more of the suits in the Divorce Court, has not yet been developed among the masses.

<sup>3</sup> *Contemporary Socialism*, by John Rae, London, 1884, Introduction. Their scheme would relieve the self-divorced inhabitants of their Utopia from all hindrance to immediate cohabitation with others by handing over their offspring to the care of the State.

pathy. And more ominously still, such claims have found support, more or less, at the hands of Mr. Lecky, Baron Wilhelm von Humboldt, and the *Westminster Review*.

Yet another and not unimportant reason for giving immediate attention to the subject of divorce in the English Convocations, is the need of information and encouragement on the same subject manifested at the recent triennial Convention of the Church in the United States, and at the quinquennial Synod of all Australia. To those assemblies, and to others in our dependencies, a thorough sifting of the question here (which may well occupy two or three sessions), and a bold adoption of the true remedy by the mother Church, would be of inestimable value, whilst our failure to lend such aid and to lead the way after once putting our hand to the plough would be proportionally disastrous. And when we add to these considerations the further fact that within twelve months Bishops of the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church will be assembling from all parts of the world for conference at Lambeth, the argument for immediate procedure is *complete*. For they will certainly expect the results of previous deliberation upon this vital matter to be submitted to them, with a view to subsequent action in their own synods and dioceses.

III. We undertook to show that the only remedy proper to the Church, or appropriate to the evil in question, is precisely of the nature which the Report of a committee of the Bishops of this province has suggested. But deferring the fuller illustration of this point until we have considered the Report in detail, we will only observe here that help in our distress from any other quarter, or of any other kind, is simply hopeless.

We cannot look to Parliament for help, for Parliament gave us the present law but thirty years ago, and rarely, if ever, rises above the moral tone of the people and the press. We must raise that tone before any direct aid, if desirable, can be expected from the Legislature.<sup>1</sup> The lawyers will not aid

<sup>1</sup> The idea which has been expressed that the evil would be met by a law inflicting *penal servitude* for adultery is simply misleading, and would result, if enacted, on the one hand in a refusal of jurors to convict, and on the other in the absence of the very proof of guilt on which spiritual censures should be based. Whether or no the charging of all the cost of judicial and other salaries, and official or court expenses, for the period occupied by these loathsome trials on the convicted offenders would be a deterrent from the sin, and an act of justice to the State, may be fair matter of argument; but there must be no association of temporal penalties with spiritual censures, or all thought of *sin* will be banished and repentance effectually hindered.

188  
us;  
an  
coll  
five  
Ken  
infl  
volu  
lack  
The  
for,  
earth  
and  
amo  
the s  
and  
the  
the v  
if En  
hono  
exclu  
of oth  
of cu  
immo  
parvi  
to the  
which  
Corin  
hear v  
  
'The c  
to  
Ap  
'1.  
the Ch  
applying  
tintently  
with an  
'2.  
been pr  
her Can  
'3.  
of adul  
canons  
the rem  
some pr  
'4.  
VOL.

us ; for not only is there no difficulty in filling from their ranks an office which brings its occupant into direct and constant collision with the law of Christ, but there are probably not five men on the Bench who, if the law remained as in Lord Kenyon's days, would have courage to repeat his sentence by inflicting on a proved adulterer a fine of 10,000*l*. And no mere voluntary association can arrest the evil, because of its utter lack of commission, authority, and admitted right to interfere. There is one quarter only from which a remedy can be looked for, and that is the Church of Christ, the ordained salt of the earth and pillar of the Truth ; one only remedy at her disposal, and that the Scriptural exercise of ecclesiastical discipline among all who profess to be her members. But what if the salt have lost its savour ? What if the ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God, shrink from turning the keys of the kingdom on those who flagrantly violate the very terms on which they were baptized into it ? What if English clergy and laity cannot combine to vindicate the honour of God, to rescue marriage from contempt, and to exclude the adulterer from communion—for the warning of others and for his own correction ? Then are we past hope of cure until at last the destructive forces of unrestrained immorality (as in the case of the Mutineers of the *Bounty*, *parvis componere magna*) may compel our posterity to return to the old paths—a distant and uncertain prospect, to wait for which, with St. Paul's successful treatment of the incestuous Corinthian before us, were simple treason. Let us therefore hear what those of our Bishops who have spoken say.

## REPORT.

'The Committee of the Upper House of Convocation, appointed to consider the *articulus cleri* on the subject of divorce, presented April 29, 1885, report as follows :—

'1. That divorce and separation *à thoro et mensâ* is allowed by the Church of England (Canon 107) on the condition that the parties applying for such separation shall engage to live chastely and continently, and shall not, during each other's life, contract matrimony with any other person.

'2. That sentence of divorce *à vinculo matrimonii* has never been pronounced by the courts of the Church of England, and that her Canons are silent on the subject.

'3. That in regard of divorce *à vinculo matrimonii* in the case of adultery the judgments of the early Councils, which have enacted canons on this subject, have not been unanimous ; some permitting the remarriage of the innocent party though advising against it, and some prohibiting it.

'4. That the judgment of the early Catholic Fathers has varied

on this subject, some allowing the remarriage of the innocent party and some prohibiting it.

'5. That the judgment of learned members of the Church of England has not always been the same ; in the *Reformatio Legum* it was recommended that divorce *à thoro et mensâ* should be abolished, and that the remarriage of the innocent party should be permitted in the case of adultery.

'6. That the Council of Trent, while distinctly prohibiting the remarriage of the innocent party, yet pronounces its *anathema*, not directly against those who permit such remarriage, but against those who affirm that the Church of Rome errs in declaring it to be unlawful.

'7. That the Greek Church recognizes divorce *à vinculo matrimonii*, and allows, but discourages, the remarriage of the innocent party.

'8. That the testimony of Holy Scripture has been adduced on both sides ; but it appears that the majority of expositors have held that our Lord's words (St. Matt. v. 32, xix. 9) are to be understood as permitting divorce *à vinculo matrimonii* in the one case of adultery. In regard of the question of remarriage, the teaching of Holy Scripture cannot be pronounced to be perfectly clear. It would, however, appear certain that in the case of putting away for any cause other than adultery neither party may marry again during the lifetime of the other, and at least highly probable that in the case of adultery and divorce consequent thereon, the remarriage of the innocent party is not absolutely prohibited.

'Having due regard to these considerations, we advise this House to make the following declaration :—

'1. That in the case where the sin of adultery shall have been fully proved before a competent court, and a decree of divorce shall have been obtained, the innocent party so set free ought to be advised not to remarry during the lifetime of the guilty party.

'2. That if, however, the innocent party shall remarry, the charity of the Church requires that the ministrations of the Church should not be withheld from the person so remarried, or from the person with whom the marriage shall have been contracted.

'3. That in the case of the remarriage of the guilty party the ministrations of the Church ought not to be granted ; saving, however, to the bishop the power, after personal investigation, to give such directions in any case of penitence as he shall consider most consonant with the teaching of Holy Scripture and the mind and practice of the Primitive Church.'

Every true man amongst us will regard this document with interest, and will be grateful for it as a step, though a faltering one, in the right direction. But no competent observer can fail to see that it is weak and inconsistent, from lack of a leading principle and from failure to grasp its subject with a firm hand. The representative character assigned by it to the *Reformatio Legum*, the construction put by it on the lan-

gua  
to t  
It p  
par  
exte  
defe  
the  
Chu  
nica  
wise  
exco  
the  
quer  
a co  
fusa  
brut  
intru  
ence  
J  
vacu  
failu  
to b  
part  
diss  
be n  
T  
further  
gran  
not  
major  
unan  
own  
Scrip  
Chur  
consi  
H  
with  
once  
gives  
tude  
all s  
the in  
1 V  
equiva  
à vinc

guage of the Council of Trent, and its unqualified reference to the later practice of the Greek Church, are all questionable. It probably errs also in its estimate of the so-called 'innocent party,' whose existence is largely disproved by the known extent of collusion. And it unquestionably falls short, and defeats its aim, by confining its remedial suggestions to such of the 'guilty parties' as may afterwards apply for marriage in the Church, instead of boldly recommending the *public excommunication by name of every proved adulterer, adulteress, or otherwise guilty divorcee*,<sup>1</sup> being professedly her members: which excommunication should be announced in the cathedral of the diocese, and in the parish church which they have frequented. For without such a provision for publicity (and a corresponding alteration in the law of libel) the bare refusal of marriage rites to such characters would be but a *brutum fulmen*, would guard no other Christian rite from their intrusion, and would exercise no corrective or deterrent influence beyond them.

But its chief blot in our eyes, and the prime cause of the vacillation and inconsistency which characterize it, is the failure to see that if, as it asserts, 'the innocent party *ought* to be advised *not* to remarry during the lifetime of the guilty party' (which must needs be because the previous marriage is dissoluble by death only) then the Church ought certainly to be no party to his or her so doing.

Through not seeing this the authors of the Report are further tempted to dignify with the name of 'charity' the grant of marriage rites to one whose *duty* they declare it is not to marry; and to shield themselves under a numerical majority of commentators and a real or imaginary want of unanimity of Councils and Fathers. Had they acted on their own concluding counsel, and regarded only 'the teaching of Scripture and the mind and practice of the [*really*] Primitive Church,' their recommendations would have been at once consistent and convincing. As it is they are not satisfactory.

Having ventured to say so much on parts of the Report with which we disagree, we would fain have proceeded at once to the consideration of that special feature of it which gives it all its value, and commands both our assent and gratitude; but it seems due to its authors that we should first of all submit categorically the grounds on which we maintain the indissolubility of holy matrimony against some authorities

<sup>1</sup> Whether the sentence of the court has been 'a judicial separation,' equivalent to divorce *à mensâ* only; or absolute dissolution, *i.e.* divorce *à vinculo*.

with whom we should prefer to agree, and possibly also against themselves.<sup>1</sup> The following are our grounds:—

1. The fact that three out of the four witnesses to our Lord's teaching on marriage and divorce are absolutely unfavourable to any dissolution of marriage, leave no opening for it, and hold the remarriage of a divorced person, whether innocent or guilty, to be absolutely adulterous so long as the other party lives (St. Mark x. 2-12; St. Luke xvi. 18; St. Paul, Rom. vii. 2-3 and 1 Cor. vii. 10, 11).

2. The fact that to make the rather ambiguous language of the fourth witness (St. Matt. v. 32 and xix. 9) overrule the very clear language of the other three, is contrary to all sound rules of interpretation, and that the more proper way of reconciling the *supposed* divergence in St. Matthew's narrative is to inquire whether the exceptional words will not bear a very different meaning from that which is now commonly assigned to them, and which admits of the remarriage of a man who has divorced his wife for adultery, during her life.

3. The fact that *both* his exceptional expressions *will bear* such different meaning, and readily admit an interpretation in harmony with the other witnesses; an interpretation which, by limiting their application to the Jews, for whom St. Matthew wrote, accounts for their entire omission by those who wrote for Gentile readers. Thus *παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας* may be as well rendered *parenthetically* and by 'apart from the question of fornication' as without parenthesis and by 'saving for the cause of fornication' (Authorized Version): with this implied meaning, that fornication by a married person being adultery,<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It will be readily understood that throughout this article we speak only of the religious ordinance known as 'holy matrimony,' and not of any mere civil contract or legalized concubinage, as being *marriage* and indissoluble. On the civil power of civil courts to dissolve civil contracts we offer no opinion. Mr. Keble said, 'The Parliament is free—nay, bound—to provide a law for the decent and profitable ordering of marriage, perhaps also of divorce, as a matter of social contract among the many subjects of the realm who profess no allegiance to the Church; and Churchmen, as good citizens, must dutifully defer to such enactments, as in any other matter merely civil and temporal; but neither is Parliament free to ordain, nor the Church to obey, anything which affects holy matrimony, as it is a spiritual and supernatural ordinance. Least of all may we give up to the State or to any created power that which is the very token and mark to distinguish the marriages which are blessed in heaven from those which are merely agreed upon on earth, viz. their absolute indissolubility' (*Sequel*, p. 217).

<sup>2</sup> If it be argued that *πορνεία* points to *ante-* and not *post-*nuptial sin, then the passage cannot be quoted at all in favour of divorce for adultery or other offence subsequent to marriage. The marriage in that case was simply voidable *ab initio* (Deut. xxiv. 1).



and by Moses' law punishable by *death*, the case was otherwise provided for. The survivor in such case would be an exception to the rule, and at liberty to marry again ;—our Lord carefully avoiding any charge of setting aside the law before the fulness of the time.

And *εἰ μὴ* (or more correctly *μὴ* only) *ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ* may as well be rendered parenthetically also, and in a similar sense, by 'not now *speaking* of fornication,' as by 'except it be for fornication : ' the sense being, 'Whoever shall put away his wife (not for *πορνεία* ; I am not speaking of that, for which a special legal provision exists) and shall marry another, committeth adultery.'<sup>1</sup>

4. The fact that whether we thus correct the reading, or the translation, or both, or leave them as they are in the Authorized Version and the received text, St. Matthew's supposed exception, on which so much mischievous legislation has been based, ceases to be any exception at all, or any difficulty, if it be remembered that what our Lord is directly considering and limiting is the Jewish pleas for divorce and remarriage ; and that He only parenthetically refers to the case in which, a capital crime having been committed, the survivor would be free to marry again at once.

5. The fact that the Church of the first three centuries—as witnessed, *e.g.*, by Hermas, Justin Martyr, Clement, Origen, and the Apostolical Canons<sup>2</sup>—ere yet her tone was lowered by

<sup>1</sup> See this argument stated at length in No. 7 at the head of this article. We have before us a letter addressed by Mr. Keble to the Rev. A. A. Hunt in November 1857, in which he expresses an opinion that the construction proposed by Mr. Baddeley may be the best. It 'limits the exception, *εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*, to the putting away, and makes the prohibition to emarry as absolute a sin in St. Matthew as in the other Gospels.' He adds, 'That divorce *à vinculo* is altogether forbidden by the Gospel I feel more and more certain.'

<sup>2</sup> Hermas, A.D. 75, *Pastor*, pars ii. Mandat. iv. : 'What if a dismissed wife do penance, and desire to return to her husband ?' 'And he' (the angel of the vision) 'said to me, "If her husband receive her not he sinneth." . . . For this cause it is commanded to you both to abide single, because that in such a case there may be penitence.'

Justin Martyr, A.D. 139, *Apol.* i. sec. 15 : 'He that marrieth one put away by another man committeth adultery.'

Clemens Alexand., A.D. 194, *Strom.* ii. sec. 144-6 : 'It is especially enacted, "Thou shalt not put away a wife except for some matter of uncleanness." And it is counted adultery to contract another marriage in the lifetime of either of the separated parties.'

Tertullian, A.D. 207, *De Monog.* c. ix. : 'Whoso marrieth her that is put away from her husband of course committeth adultery : because neither can the divorced woman lawfully marry ; and if she have committed any sin of that kind it admits not the title of adultery save on account of her matrimony, in that adultery is a crime incident to the marriage state.'

worldly contact, recognized no divergence between the teaching of the three and of the one, and no plea for allowing Christians to suppose themselves loosed by divorce from the bond of matrimony and free to marry; but, on the contrary, visited such error with her most dread sentence—*excommunication*.

6. The fact that the Apostles themselves, when questioning our Lord in private (as shown by a comparison of St. Mark x. and St. Matthew xix.) on the meaning of His words as given by the latter, apparently understood Him as *altogether* disallowing divorce *à vinculo*, and were encouraged in that view by His reply.

7. The fact that in St. Matthew, not less than in St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul, the remarriage of a divorced person, whether innocent or guilty, is spoken of as *adultery*, which, as we have said, it could not be if the previous marriage had been dissolved—in other words, if the divorce permitted by our Lord were *à vinculo*.<sup>1</sup>

8. The fact of our Lord's repeated reference to the original institution of marriage as making the married pair 'one flesh' and admitting of no dissolution. His sentence was, 'What God hath joined together let not man put asunder.'

9. The fact, forcibly urged by both Hermas and Clement of

Origen, A.D. 230, *In Matt.* xix. 16-24: 'Instances have occurred in which certain governors of the Church have permitted a person to marry a woman in the lifetime of her husband, *thus doing contrary to the Scripture*, which saith, "A wife is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth."' The excuse which Origen suggested for the bishops in question is but a poor one, and in no way derogates from the force of his own testimony against recognizing any divorce as being *à vinculo* or any valid marriage as being dissoluble.

The forty-seventh of the Apostolical Canons we have already cited. The eighth canon of the Council of Elvira, about A.D. 310, forbids a baptized woman who has separated from a baptized but adulterous husband to marry another man, under pain of exclusion from Communion, until her first husband is dead (except *in articulo*). And the tenth canon of Arles, in 314, is of similar tenor, though in rather weaker terms.—See *Sequel*, pp. 5-35.

<sup>1</sup> If (as in St. Matt. xix. 9) the man who marries a guilty divorcee commits *adultery*, it is plain that she is still her separated husband's wife, her marriage being indissoluble even by adultery. And if so it is equally plain that the man, being her husband still, cannot marry any other woman while she lives. And this is the sum of our contention. The indissolubility of marriage is implied by St. Matthew in yet another way; for as he represents our Lord replying to pleas for divorce by reminding His questioners that God made a male and a female only, to enforce monogamy; so he asserts that the two were made 'one flesh,' to enforce indissolubility. Divorce, therefore, on St. Matthew's showing, is equally forbidden with bigamy (see Chrysostom, quoted by Sadler on St. Mark x. 7).

Alexandria,<sup>1</sup> that divorce *à vinculo* would cut off all hope of reconciliation, discouraging both repentance and forgiveness, and preventing a return to family duties.<sup>2</sup>

10. The fact that St. Matthew's first *supposed* exception to indissolubility occurs amidst a number of illustrations of the far greater moral strictness of the Gospel than of the law; whereas if marriage is now dissoluble, and the guilty party be therefore free to marry his or her paramour, or any other person, then the Christian is laxer than the Mosaic law. And this is what our Divorce Court makes it.

11. The fact that the Authorized Version of that same passage—'Whosoever shall put away his wife, *saving for the cause of fornication*, causeth her to commit adultery'—if not taken parenthetically, implies that if she were innocent of the fornication, the putting her away would *not* expose her to adultery, which is absurd. Better far interpret as above, 'not to speak of fornication,' and then to leave the verse a clear declaration against dissolubility.

12. The fact that the supposed difference between the three witnesses, and the one, imputes to our Lord an intention to allow two different codes to go forth as laws of His kingdom, which could only be harmonized at some distant period, when the Gospels should be collected together, by reading St. Matthew into St. Mark and St. Luke, whilst even then St. Paul might remain uncorrected. To such an imputation we object.

13. The fact that the sense commonly put on St. Matthew's language, as if authorizing dissolution for adultery, seems to involve, if we may so say, a lack of foresight or an indifference on our Lord's part as to the effect which the opening of that one door would have upon future ages, in the encouragement of collusion and adultery such as we now see: which it were blasphemy to maintain.

14. The fact that the use made by St. Paul (Eph. v. 22-23) of our Lord's oneness with His saints, and of His headship of the Church, to illustrate the connexion of husband and wife, is a yet further testimony against divorce *à vinculo*; for Christ's connexion with the Church being inseparable, so also must be that union which is illustrated by it.

15. The fact that St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, and others, though they extended the application of St. Matthew's

<sup>1</sup> See *Sequel*, pp. 6, 10.

<sup>2</sup> Gross and deadly as were the spiritual whoredoms and adulteries of idolatrous Israel, yet God never cast her off beyond hope of repentance and return (Ezek. xvi. and Hos. ii.)

exceptional expressions to Christians (or rather did not render them parenthetically and as pertaining to the Jews only), did as absolutely as the Apostolical Canon condemn the remarriage of a divorced person during the lifetime of both parties, and did, therefore, as plainly oppose divorce *à vinculo* as St. Paul or Justin.

16. The fact that the English Church has always maintained the indissolubility of marriage 'until death do us part,' both by her marriage office and by granting divorce only *à mensâ*, &c., and has thereby adhered to primitive precedent; and the further fact that the whole Western Church has in theory and professedly done the same.<sup>1</sup>

These reasons, we grant, are not all of equal force; but, after any elimination of the weaker arguments, more than enough, we think, remains to establish our position.

To return now to the Report.

In spite of what we deem its defects, which may be disproved or corrected when it comes to be discussed by both Houses, it is for several reasons a document of great value. For, first, it tends to fasten attention on those features of sensual socialism which find acceptance where its other proposals are scouted, and which are as clouds darkening our horizon—namely, contempt for the marriage vow, repudiation of parental responsibility, and a virtual demand for liberty to cohabit and to separate without restraint of law. Secondly, it is the most direct response yet made by Convocation to the chief motive and plea of those who in fact restored its vitality and action; for their earliest addresses to the Crown and Primate in favour of the revival were based on the hindrance to religious progress caused by the abeyance of Church discipline,<sup>2</sup> and the consequent profanation of her ordinances to the encouragement of evildoers. And, thirdly, it strikes the true note. It points Churchmen to a remedy provided by Christ Himself, and within their own sphere. It cleaves to the 'old paths and the good way,' and no longer delegates to the secular arm the work proper to the Kingdom of God.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The argument is good, whatever inconsistency may be charged against Rome for the excessive claim and exercise of dispensing power by which the important difference between declaring a marriage void *ab initio*, and dissolving a valid marriage, is dangerously obscured.

<sup>2</sup> The term 'Church discipline,' now so often in the mouths of bishops and public speakers, as if it meant only discipline for the clergy, was then used in its true and proper sense as applying to the whole body of the Church. See *Memoir of Henry Hoare, with Narrative of the Revival of Convocation*, c. iii. (London: Rivingtons, 1869).

<sup>3</sup> That admixture of temporal sanctions with spiritual sentences which

It pr  
which  
down  
long  
tial t  
dista  
and  
discip  
one o  
the C  
term  
depr  
for d  
catio

T  
had,  
clara  
man  
up th  
have  
bears  
consi  
at fa  
say, I  
Mar  
such  
that  
be pu  
adult

N  
brose

...  
A  
perve  
for r  
(save  
the p  
comm  
must  
milita

was p  
was c  
and e  
'Hoc  
(Aug.

It proposes once more to meet spiritual offences with 'weapons which are not carnal,' but 'mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds;' and to resume the use of that too long dormant power of 'binding and loosing' which is essential to the Church's office and to the survival of morality. It distantly echoes the sentiments of the Communion Service, and it aims at the recovery of that 'right use of ecclesiastical discipline' which our Homily for Whit Sunday affirms to be one of the 'marks of the true Church.' It assumes and asserts the Church's right, as a spiritual kingdom, to enforce her own terms of membership, and to punish the violation of them by deprivation of her privileges; and it offers a splendid thesis for devout discussion, with a large opportunity for the application of learning and wisdom.

To recapitulate: The parish priests of the southern province had, by their proctors, asked their Bishops for a 'synodical declaration' under the difficulties arising from an increased demand for marriage by divorced persons, and had thus opened up the whole subject for their consideration. Their lordships have answered as yet by a committee only, and their answer bears marks of lack of time for treating so large a subject consistently. But they propounded the true remedy, though at fault as to the extent and degree of its application. They say, plainly, that Spiritual Censures must be revived; that the Marriage Office, and Holy Communion, must be denied to such of the 'guilty parties' in divorce suits as apply for them; that proved adultery must thus incur *anathema*, and the wicked be put away, 'that others may see it and fear'—in a word, that adultery and divorce must be met by the 'Power of the Keys.'

Now what is this Power of the Keys, of which St. Ambrose is reported to have said, 'Claves illas regni cœlorum . . . in beato Petro cuncti suscepimus sacerdotes'?

Apart from the prejudices raised against it by such palpable perversions of it as mediæval interdicts, excommunications for reading the Scriptures, and the like, it is nothing more (save as to its Divine origin, its sanctions, and its sphere) than the power of *admission, exclusion, and readmission* which every community or association having a definite purpose and laws must possess and exercise, whether it be civil or religious, military or naval, legal or medical, an insurance office or a

was proper to the mixed character of the kingdom of the literal Israel, was carefully excluded from the 'Kingdom of God' by its Divine Founder, and every attempt to restore it has issued in paralyzing the spiritual arm.

\* Hoc nunc agit in Ecclesiâ Excommunicatio, quod tunc agebat Interfectio' (Aug. *Quæst. in Deut.* lib. v. cap. 38).

friendly society, a republic or a kingdom. And just as no man of common sense would now propose that the right of expatriation should cease to be recognized among European nations because of its recent abuse for the banishment of the Orleans princes from France, so no intelligent Churchman would object to a restored and guarded use of the power of excommunication because, forsooth, like every other trust committed to man, it has been at times abused.

There are, however, just two parties who might oppose it—namely, the fanatics, on the one hand, who deem all claim to an Apostolic succession, and to this power as accompanying it, to be a ‘mark of the Beast’;<sup>1</sup> and the questionable interpreters of Scripture and history, on the other hand, who conceive that a system of *private* confessions, penances, and absolutions is an ample substitute for the ancient *public* discipline, and fulfils the Divine purpose in authorizing the Apostles to bind and loose<sup>2</sup> (St. Matt. xviii. 15–20, xvi. 17–19; St. John xx. 23; 1 Cor. v. 3–5; 1 Thess. v. 14; 1 Tim. i. 19–20; Tit. iii. 10).

To neither of these parties, we are confident, will Convocation yield for a moment. The Bishops who formed the committee to which the Report is due have, we may hope, nailed their colours to the mast so far as regards the *nature* of the remedy, and mean to stand by them. In fact they have no honourable alternative, their bridges being burnt behind them: for all secular aids (if aids they ever were) are gone beyond recovery; and they must advance unsupported, or fall as the timid fall, who see the line they ought to take but are afraid to take it.

That the true remedy was only to be found in the direc-

<sup>1</sup> Among the strictest enforcers of a quasi-primitive discipline amongst us are the more exclusive sections of Plymouth Brethren. All honour to them for their effort; however Donatistic their spirit and false their assurance. But it would be difficult to identify such abjurers of any ministerial authority with the Beast or with Babylon.

<sup>2</sup> How far this conception is from being true may be gathered from the following pregnant sentence of Dr. Pusey: ‘It is certain from the evidence that the early Church had no obligatory confession except that of overt acts of sin, with a view to public penitence’ (*Tertullian’s Works*, ‘Lib. Pat.’ i. 407, note *m*, quoted at p. 42 of No. 8 at the head of this article. The marvellous objection offered to a revival of Church courts and spiritual censures by a deceased Bishop within our memory, has probably no representatives at this date. He objected ‘because, whilst the Apostles had a power of searching men’s hearts, we, or their successors, have none.’ Had his lordship been brought to book, the New Testament would have failed to supply him with the shadow of a single instance of the exercise or existence or assertion of any such power.

tion  
varie  
(  
attri  
Prus  
scien  
after  
over  
are l  
prev  
form  
of m  
(  
Sout  
refus  
offer  
agai  
(  
for h  
bish  
com  
(  
disci  
mec  
(  
it;  
keys  
worl  
her  
reap  
puri  
whe  
Chr  
(  
1  
2  
the  
refus  
supp  
has  
of Ir  
be in  
divor  
of th  
party  
stitut  
and l  
Prete



tion pointed out by their lordships may be gathered from a variety of evidence; e.g.—

(a) Recent experience suggests it. Thus Baron von Gerlach attributes the only check on the development of divorce in Prussia to the disciplinary refusal of a benediction by 'conscientious clergymen' on the remarriage of divorced persons after a certain synod at Frankfort in 1854.<sup>1</sup> He draws moreover a clear distinction between the parts of Prussia which are Roman Catholic and those which are Lutheran, as to the prevalence of divorce; a distinction entirely in favour of the former by reason of stricter discipline and a higher estimate of marriage.

(b) Our own mission fields suggest it; for both in India and South Africa bishops<sup>2</sup> have been compelled to authorize the refusal of marriage rites and Holy Communion to notorious offenders, as the Church's only means of protest and protection against the tacit sanction of adultery and of divorce *à vinculo*.

(c) Our Order for the Consecration of Bishops suggests it; for by due exercise of corrective discipline alone can Anglican bishops fulfil their vows, and exercise the spiritual power committed to them.

(d) Our canons, articles, and rubrics moreover assume such discipline to be in working order, as a necessary part of Church mechanism.

(e) The practice and character of the Early Church suggest it; for not without a very faithful use of the power of the keys did she maintain that practical distinction between the world and herself which enabled 'him that ran' to recognize her Divine origin. And not without like fidelity can we hope to reapproach even distantly that glorious era when the moral purity of her members was the Church's chief credential, and when the inability of her bitterest foes to discover a single Christian's name on their calendar of criminals furnished her

<sup>1</sup> *Ubi sup.* p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> In a *Pastoral Letter on the Church and the Imperial Divorce Law*, the Bishop of Bombay said in 1882: 'To all clergymen who may refuse to marry any divorced person whatever I promise my unflinching support as men who are obeying Christ's law as the Church of England has ever understood it.' In January 1883 the Bishops of the Provinces of India and Ceylon resolved in conference as follows: 'That it cannot be insisted on as the duty of any minister of the Church to marry any divorced person, whether convicted of adultery or not, during the lifetime of the other party: while the marriage, during the lifetime of the injured party, of a person against whom adultery has been legally proved, constitutes an offence against the Church, both by the parties contracting it and by the minister performing it.' See also the *Canons of the Diocese of Pretoria*, of 1883.

apologists with their most telling defence.<sup>1</sup> The era of greatest purity was the era of *sternest* discipline; and the absence of offences against the laws of the State by professed Christians, was clearly connected with the enforcement of the law Divine within the Church.

(f) The contrast between that period and our own equally suggests it. For ours is an era of *suspended* discipline, of laxity, and *ἀνομιὰ*: and therewith, to our shame and sorrow it must be owned, the profession of Christianity, or Church membership, is so far from being a guarantee of holiness, or even common morality, that, whilst at home our prisons and our penitentiaries are filled with the baptized, and the vilest licentiousness puts on a religious garb, the one thing most dreaded by our missionaries on foreign shores, is the approach of an English vessel manned by nominal disciples of our Lord, whose demoralization and example may undo in ten days the work of years.

(g) Finally, the canons of the Universal Church, and of particular or national Churches, and pre-eminently the Word of God,<sup>2</sup> all alike suggest it, and plainly show that from the days of Ananias and Sapphira, or of the incestuous Corinthian, down to our own day the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, however at times misapplied, were always and everywhere regarded as essential instruments for the discouragement of vice and for the promotion of godliness. Nor can there be a reasonable doubt that the revived use of that greatest of human judgments, as Lord Bacon called it, excommunication, would raise the whole tone of our morality, would diminish the number of adulterers, and reduce the petitions for divorce. There is doubtless for the corporate Church, as well as for her individual members, 'a time to keep silence, and a time to speak;' but her silence has been prolonged until it savours of compromise, and her time to speak has fully come. From pulpit and altar she must speak at once and with no faltering voice, echoing and executing the decrees of her representa-

<sup>1</sup> Blunt's *Early Fathers*, p. 522; Farrar, *ubi sup.* p. 10. 'Non loquimur, sed vivimus,' was the reply of the meek and the unlearned.

<sup>2</sup> Few persons who have not made it matter of special inquiry have any true idea of the extent of the Scriptural evidence in favour of a watchful exercise of public spiritual censures and excommunication. A summary of it, drawn largely from the great work of Dean Comber, may be found in the pamphlet No. 8 at the head of this article. For a general idea of the disciplinary canons and practice of the Church at various periods, and especially in the third and fourth centuries, the reader may consult Bingham, Marshall, and Pellicia. For the 'Pœnitential Discipline of England' (A.D. 740 or 963, *e.g.*), he will refer to Johnson's *English Canons*, part i. pp. 226-33 and 426-49.

tive  
must  
rema  
her  
the  
'whe  
Parli  
her  
centu  
her m  
mess  
catio  
we m  
such  
curre

E  
in ou  
zeal,  
shou  
plain  
destr  
unite  
of th  
datic  
conce  
publi  
to pr

1  
of any  
the pu  
the pr  
none  
all he  
were l

2  
moral  
the ai  
as we  
incest  
severa  
his di  
succes  
before  
tinctio  
divorc  
3  
No. 8  
law re  
code.

tive synods and the sentiments of her faithful laity. She must eject adulterers from her communion, put a stop to the remarriage of divorcees until severed by death, and guard her sacred rites from misapplication and abuse. This is the *minimum* of her disciplinary duty, and must be faced 'whether men will hear or whether they will forbear;' whether Parliament, for example, will gratefully accept and facilitate her action, or blindly oppose it. Her attitude for nearly a century has exposed her to the charge of indifference, and her most devoted sons have trembled at the thought that the message to the angel of Thyatira might have a direct application to the Church of England.<sup>1</sup> Let us hope and pray that we may be yet in time to disprove such charges, and to remove such fears; to stem and turn the tide of profligacy, and the current of national decay.

But again we say, not a day should be lost.<sup>2</sup> No divisions in our councils should mar the force of unanimity. No party zeal, no individual conceit, and no *ad captandum* imputations should find utterance, when the power to be asserted is as plainly Scriptural as the evil to be combated is degrading and destructive. May both Houses in both provinces, whether united in one national synod or not, with the hearty support of the House or Houses of laymen, endorse the recommendations of the Report so far as the *nature* of the remedy is concerned, and then combine to extend its scope and give publicity to its application. May they also be wisely guided to provide a simple *method of procedure*,<sup>3</sup> and thus hasten the

<sup>1</sup> This is not said depreciatingly, or with reference to the better state of any other portion of the Catholic Church. For we know of none where the purely corrective and remedial exercise of the power of the keys, after the primitive manner, is to be found. And more than this: we know of none to which we could not say (as being of the Church of England, with all her faults), 'I would that not only thou, but all that hear me this day, were both almost and altogether such as I am, except these bonds.'

<sup>2</sup> The loss of time, we repeat, means the unhindered progress of immorality and immoral legislation. The '*Deceased Wife's Sister*' Bill, by the aid of the divorce law, would become the '*Divorced Wife's Sister*' Bill as well; and through the Church's failure to anathematize adultery and incest, an Englishman ere long may be the successive legal husband of several living sisters; or, as we should put it, the adulterous husband of his divorced wife and the adulterous and incestuous cohabitor with a succession of his sisters! And meantime the inequality of the sexes before the law, already infamous, would be exaggerated by the legal extinction of 'incestuous adultery,' at present the wife's main plea for a divorce.

<sup>3</sup> Suggestions *ad hoc*, from various sources, will be found in c. vi. of No. 8 at the head of this article, together with a statement of necessary law reforms and other measures requisite for the working out a disciplinary code.

day when grave offences against purity shall be punished as of old, when carnal sin shall be viewed with general abhorrence, when our youth shall regard their bodies as temples of God's Spirit, when Christianity shall no longer be reproached with tolerating uncleanness, when the appearance of *unreality* which now haunts us from the font to the grave, and forms the great stumbling-block of Nonconformity, shall have passed away,<sup>1</sup> and when the Bride of the Lord shall be once more seen 'fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.'<sup>2</sup>

#### ART. IV.—THE EMPRESS EUDOCIA.

*Athenais: Geschichte einer byzantinischen Kaiserin.* Von FERDINAND GREGOROVIOUS. (Leipzig, 1882.)

OFTEN, when gazing on the picture of some exciting scene or gorgeous pageant, we feel our interest gradually centre in some one figure or group of figures. These may not be the most gaudy or even the most prominent, but for us they are the most attractive or the most suggestive, and we please our fancy by tracing in the background or accessories the causes or motives of the expression we find so alluring. Thus, too, we look back on the crowded canvas of the past. The whole seems confused and perplexing, but we single out here a figure and there a group of absorbing interest.

Such a figure is that of Athenais, such the groups about her youth in Athens and her later years in Constantinople. But the hand of a master is needed to arrange the picture, filling in the details, placing the groups in true perspective, and giving the necessary touches of light and shade to the whole. This has lately been done for Germans by Dr. Gregorovius, and we trust that those of our readers to whom the finished picture is not accessible may find our rough sketch from his masterpiece not without interest.

<sup>1</sup> We might add, when un-English dames shall no longer defend, in public or in private, the reception of titled adulterers in their assemblies (as was done in the late infamous Colin Campbell case).

<sup>2</sup> Surely the power of the Church to impress souls, and to deter them from sin by her spiritual censures, is here implied; and, as we have experienced a doctrinal revival for light and a ritual revival for order (though amidst much imperfection and infirmity), we may hope for a disciplinary revival for holiness, to complete the circle of renovation.

Athenais was the daughter of an Athenian philosopher, and was born at Athens about the year 400, nearly 350 years therefore after St. Paul's visit to Athens, and 130 years before the Athenian schools of philosophy were silenced, and the seven last philosophers left their country in despair. Leontius, her father, was a Sophist; he is so called by the Greek historian Socrates, and is mentioned by Olympiodorus, a writer and statesman who enjoyed a considerable reputation in Constantinople, and visited Athens; but the name of Leontius is not included in the account of the Sophists of that time by Eunapius, and it is certain that his daughter's fame alone has rescued him from oblivion. Yet he filled a considerable position in Athens, and must have been a man of influence among his fellow-citizens. His house, no doubt, was beautiful and luxurious, after the custom of Athenian philosophers, and his children—two sons and a daughter—must have enjoyed every advantage that education and society could give.

The Greek philosophers all liked to instruct their daughters in their own peculiar branch of learning, and Leontius was well rewarded for his pains. Lovely in form and feature, gifted with unusual talents, and trained with exceeding care, Athenais soon surpassed the very high standard of cultivation which generally obtained among well-bred women of that time. She was able to recite with equal success verses from the tragic poets and brilliant passages from Demosthenes and Lysias. She could write clever letters, and express her feelings either in prose or verse, after the exaggerated manner of that age. She could discuss the theories of ancient authors, or state in correct form the problems of the Sophists. She could improvise and declaim, or argue with the rhetoricians of the time, and, as she herself said in later years, she never forgot her Homer.

Time and place were favourable to this development. Athens had become renowned as a school or university.<sup>1</sup> It was full of professors, philosophers, rhetoricians, and teachers of every kind. It was no longer what it had been for centuries—the centre of human progress, the capital of the republic of thought—but it had become one of the last asylums of Liberalism, the Holy City of every cultivated mind, the point to which all who loved truth and beauty made pilgrimage.

While Athenais was yet a girl, Plutarch came to Athens,

<sup>1</sup> Renan, *St. Paul*, 176, 185.

and remained there till his death. Whether Athenais was personally acquainted with him and his celebrated daughter Asklepigenia we do not know, but at least she must have been influenced by his teaching. Although herself named after the Goddess of Wisdom, and brought up by her father in the old pagan faith, she had, in all probability, met with many Christians, and possessed some knowledge of their doctrines and practice. But the Christian Church must have presented few attractions to a cultivated pagan, unless brought within the personal influence of her Divine spirit. Ghostly relics and the bones of martyrs would be contrasted with the glorious forms in which the old religion had embodied nature, symbols of death with symbols of heroic life, renunciation with enjoyment.

Yet in Athens the old faith was perhaps longer possible than elsewhere. This city might be said to be always in opposition, always on the side of a lost cause—for the independence of Greece, for Mithridates against the Romans, for Pompey against Cæsar, for the Republicans against the Triumvirs, for Antony against Octavius.<sup>1</sup> In this city, so full of classic memories and the masterpieces of classic art, the edicts passed by emperors for the destruction of altars and temples were never completely carried out. In the time of Athenais the temples were closed for religious purposes, but they were not destroyed, as they were in Syria, Africa, or Egypt. Gods and goddesses might in many cases be removed, but the uninjured temples were used as public buildings. The old faith was protected and kept up by long-established learned institutions, and public feeling was too strong to permit the destruction decreed by law; it had not uttered its last word, but the cruel shocks it had undergone had deprived its voice of power and spirit.

Athenais never herself beheld any of the splendid pageants that had once honoured the festivals of the goddess after whom she was named—she knew them only from the sculptures of Phidias on the frieze of the Parthenon. She never worshipped in the temple of the Muses at Ilissos or before the statues of the Goddess of Wisdom in the temples of Athene Polias and the Parthenon, although in her time these were not yet removed. She could only observe such festivals secretly in her father's house, with some fear of discovery. Thus, we are told that when Asklepigenia was ill and given up by the physicians, her father, desiring to implore the assistance of

<sup>1</sup> Renan, *St. Paul*, 177.

Escu  
story  
with  
relig  
that  
to th

I  
educ  
he di  
the m  
to hi  
Athe  
beyo  
was c  
desti

H  
to p  
divisi  
herse  
there  
aside  
show  
most

T  
occup  
but th  
Pulch  
posse  
This p  
it was  
a fitti  
and at

H  
to the  
to spe  
the ray  
to the  
orthoc  
as she  
a clois  
piety,  
worke  
the fin  
pleasu  
in the

VOL



Esculapius, entreated the philosopher Proclus, who tells the story, to aid him to carry out his design. The two friends with great secrecy entered the temple and performed the religious service after the old fashion, taking many precautions that so bold an act of defiance should not be made known to the government.

Leontius, though he gave his daughter every advantage of education and culture, neglected to find her a husband before he died. He seems, however, to have had no misgivings on the matter, and made an extraordinary will leaving all he had to his two sons and nothing but a hundred gold pieces to Athenais, with the remark that she possessed a fortune far beyond that of any other woman. In after years, the saying was circulated that Leontius had read his daughter's brilliant destiny in the stars.

However that might be, it is certain that Athenais, unable to persuade her brothers to consent to a more equitable division of the property, repaired to Constantinople, placed herself under the protection of her mother's sister, who lived there, and endeavoured to get her father's unjust will set aside. A glance at the position of affairs in that city will show that the beautiful and gifted orphan arrived there at a most opportune moment.

The Byzantine throne was then (A.D. 420) nominally occupied by Theodosius II., a youth of twenty years of age, but the reins of government were actually held by his sister Pulcheria, who, though not more than two years his senior, possessed all the vigour and ability in which he was deficient. This princess was so renowned for her wisdom and piety, that it was even said she was directly inspired by heaven to become a fitting guardian to her brother and regent of the kingdom, and at fifteen she received the rank and title of Augusta.

Hypatia, who had a few years before fallen a noble victim to the passions of the Christian rabble of Alexandria, was, so to speak, a pagan saint, whose lovely form was illuminated by the rays of the setting sun of heathenism. Athenais belonged to the transition, but Pulcheria was an enthusiastic and orthodox Christian, a power in the Church of her time. Young as she was, she transformed the most corrupt of palaces into a cloister, imbued her brother and sisters with the spirit of piety, and banished all idleness and levity. The princesses worked and prayed and sang hymns, filling up their time with the finest needlework, renouncing marriage and all worldly pleasures. A specimen of their industry was long preserved in the Church of St. Sophia—an altar-cloth adorned with gold

and diamonds, on which Pulcheria had embroidered a solemn vow of dedication of herself and her offering. With this conventual piety was united in Pulcheria all the fine culture of the age. She, like Hypatia and Athenais, had studied under the first philosophers, but to a knowledge of Greek and Latin literature Pulcheria added that of the Christian Church. After reforming the Imperial household, she gave herself to the education and training of her brother. She sought to remove every hurtful influence and to surround him with men of worth and ability, desiring above all things to clear the palace of the parasites and flatterers who infested it. This evil, however, was of such long standing that her efforts were but partially successful.

The city of Constantinople and its Imperial Court presented a strange mixture of Christianity and Heathenism, bigotry and toleration. The highest offices were filled by pagans, and many pagan philosophers of mark resided in that city. Pagan learning was the groundwork of the education of the Imperial children. Under Pulcheria's direction Theodosius had been instructed in all the liberal arts and sciences; but pious exercises and a conventual purity of life satisfied her ideal, and the vigour and energy needed for the training of a great ruler were altogether wanting. If, indeed, Pulcheria had succeeded in bringing up the young Byzantine prince to be great and good, amid the corruption of Constantinople and the vices of the Imperial palace, she would have fairly substantiated her claim to divine inspiration. But it is doubtful if her aim even were so exalted. She seems to have altogether ignored the high duties to which the sovereign of a vast empire is called, and to have been content to make Theodosius into a creditable lay figure to fill the throne, while she herself transacted the actual business of the Empire.

She encouraged her brother to perfect himself in every social accomplishment; he excelled in riding, fencing, and hunting, and became very dexterous in shooting with the bow. He was in fact trained only too carefully; Pulcheria herself taught him how to wear his robes with grace and dignity, and to sit, move, or stand in becoming attitudes—training and teaching him till he became a mere automaton.

At last the time arrived when it was desirable that Theodosius should marry, and Pulcheria determined to seek a wife for him, irreproachable in character, beautiful, and accomplished. Pulcheria and Paulinus, the most intimate friend of Theodosius, had many consultations on this matter, but could find no one

among the ladies of Constantinople who satisfied their requirements.

At this very moment came Athenais to Constantinople, endeavouring to obtain a reversion of her father's unjust will.

With this object she presented a petition to Pulcheria, who was at once struck with her extraordinary beauty, the eloquence and refinement of her conversation, and the purity of her Greek. On learning from the aunt that Athenais was the daughter of an Athenian philosopher, she invited both ladies to remain in the palace, and took the petition at once to her brother, telling him that she had found a maiden of exquisite beauty, a Greek of the highest culture and character. This excited the Emperor's curiosity so much that he insisted on concealing himself behind a curtain during Pulcheria's next interview with Athenais, in order that he might judge for himself. As Pulcheria expected, Theodosius was perfectly satisfied, and fell so violently in love that he decided at once to marry her as soon as she had been baptized. At her baptism she exchanged her beautiful name 'Athenais' for that of Eudocia.

The first and most authentic mention of Athenais is made by the contemporary historian Socrates, who, when describing the return of the victorious generals from Persia and the praises they received, says that a panegyric in their honour was composed by the Empress—

'For she was extremely learned; a daughter of the Sophist Leontius from Athens, instructed by her father and by him initiated into many sciences. When the Emperor wished to marry her, Bishop Atticus made her a Christian, and at her baptism gave her the name of Eudocia instead of that of Athenais.'

Two or three other contemporary writers mention the marriage still more curtly, but it was not till the seventh century that mythical additions were made to the story. By that time the Athenian Academy had itself been surrounded with myths, and the fable sprang up describing the departure from Athens of the daughter of Leontius, conducted by seven Athenian philosophers. The number is mythical—the ancient sages of Greece were seven, the last philosophers of Athens who left their country in despair were seven, and the sad companions of Athenais must be seven.

There are several variations of this legend, and in one of them the seven philosophers are made to conduct not Athenais, but her brothers, to Constantinople, and are represented as interceding for them with the Empress. They are also

said to have been taken by the Emperor Theodosius himself to the Hippodrome, with the hope of obtaining from them some private information regarding the statues collected in that building, to many of which mysterious and magical histories were attached. The seven sad philosophers, however, do not seem to have thrown much light on the origin of the ancient statues, but they were emphatic in bewailing the decline of paganism, and prophesying of evil days to come.

Amid all these legends, however, the fact remains indisputable that Athenais, throwing herself at the feet of Pulcheria in the hope of obtaining redress for her wrongs, won the admiration and respect of Pulcheria and the love of Theodosius, was instructed in the doctrines of Christianity, baptized by the name of Eudocia, and speedily married to the Emperor. How long a time her instruction and conversion required we do not know; for the Byzantine historians tell of her baptism and marriage in one breath, but probably the interval was not long. By encouraging this marriage, it is possible that Pulcheria hoped to retain her power in the management of the Imperial household longer than she would have done had the Emperor chosen his wife from one of the noble families of Constantinople. Some writers have fixed the age of Athenais at the time of her marriage (June 7, A.D. 421) at twenty-seven years, but it seems more probable, considering the age of the Emperor, that Nicephorus is right in making her only twenty. No accounts of the marriage or description of the bride's beauty are extant; the chroniclers merely note that the city of Constantinople celebrated the marriage of the Emperor with public games and chariot races.

The palace where Athenais was now mistress might rather be called a labyrinth of palaces, courts, and gardens, decorated with Oriental luxury, as well as with the spoils of Grecian art. In its midst was the great throne-room for the State gatherings, when the Empresses occupied the far-famed porphyry chamber in which the Imperial children must first see the light.

Beautifully situated on the narrow sea which divides Europe from Asia, the palace overlooked the Imperial city, and marble steps led down to the water-side, where splendid vessels lay anchored for the use of the Emperor. To the south lay the rich suburbs of Triklinium, leading to the grand Hippodrome, the central point of Constantinople and all the pleasures and passions of its turbulent inhabitants. There stood the four golden horses which had been taken from Athens to Chios and from thence to the Imperial city, and

in the midst of the circus was the great Egyptian obelisk erected there by Theodosius the Great.

It must have required great tact and cleverness on the part of Athenais to take her place with ease and grace in the Court ceremonial so new to her, and to win and retain the respect, if not the love, of the nobility and old-established courtiers, who probably looked on her as an upstart. Every morning the marble floors in the palace were strewed with gold-dust by hundreds of slaves, and when the Empress moved from one room to another she had to be conducted by the ladies of the Court between rows of officials who would certainly look with no approval on the philosopher's daughter from Athens, although they were obliged to bow before her to the ground. This strict ceremonial originated with Diocletian, and the numberless officials were divided into ranks or classes under the master of the palace, while the superintendence of the Emperor's personal attendants devolved on one called the *Prepositus* of the sacred bedchamber.

Under the pressure of this Court etiquette Athenais must often have longed to be back again in the Groves of Cephissos; and she may not unfrequently have doubted the reality of her good fortune. However this might be, she certainly for many years enjoyed her husband's affection. But Theodosius was a bigot in religion and a bookworm in literature. He had none of the passions of manhood, and was perhaps as much attracted to Athenais by her learning as by her beauty. He often studied all night by the light of a lamp which he had so elaborately contrived that he had to trim it and fill it himself. He dipped into Greek and Latin literature, mathematics and astronomy. He was learned about stones and plants. He dabbled in drawing, painting, and sculpture. He wrote such fine manuscripts in gold letters, ornamented so beautifully with miniatures, that both flatterers and scoffers alike called him the 'Calligrapher.' In the thirteenth century codices were shown of his writing, some of which were the Gospels written page after page in the form of a cross. He collected books with the greatest zeal, but they were mostly religious. He rose early to sing hymns with his sisters; he fasted twice in every week. He had but one worldly passion, and that was hunting. These qualities could not make Theodosius a great statesman or a great sovereign. Priests lauded him to the skies, but laymen despised him as a weakling.

He is described by a contemporary as a man of middle size, with fair hair, well-shaped nose, piercing black eyes, very long eyelashes, and most polite manners. At the time of

his marriage Theodosius, much against his will, was engaged in a great war with Persia, but the following year his generals gained such decisive victories that peace was concluded and they were able to return home. This event was celebrated with much joy, and Eudocia herself composed a poem in heroic verse in honour of the victory, and presented it to her husband. Unfortunately this poem no longer exists, but it must have been a performance more suitable to the Heathen Athenais than to the Christian Eudocia.

In the year 422 Eudocia bore a daughter, who received the name of Licinia Eudoxia, and was destined to a fate almost as wonderful as her mother's. Soon after this event Theodosius bestowed on Eudocia the title of Augusta, and she then assumed the Imperial robes. She was represented on the coins of that time as wearing a simple diadem of pearls across the forehead. This Byzantine diadem was afterwards much more elaborate, till in the portrait of the wife of Justinian we see it fantastically overladen with pearls and precious stones.

When Eudocia's hard-hearted brothers heard the extraordinary news that their sister had become Empress, they fled in terror to a place of refuge in Greece. She, however, found them out and had them safely conveyed to Constantinople and brought before her. Instead of punishing them, she told them that if they had not treated her so cruelly she should never have been an empress, and that she felt she had to thank them for the crown she wore. At her request Theodosius made one of them Prefect of Illyria, and gave the other some important office at home. But though she was able to obtain these favours for her brothers, Eudokia does not seem to have exercised any influence on the treatment of her old friends in Athens. The pious Pulcheria still ruled in her brother's kingdom; and although Eudocia was now her equal in rank, it was no doubt some time before she obtained much power in public affairs.

Meanwhile another personage appears upon the scene. In the summer of 423 Galla Placidia, sister of Honorius, Emperor of the Western Empire, and aunt to Theodosius, landed at Constantinople. This unfortunate princess had first been Queen of the Goths, then a captive, and afterwards married to the conqueror, Constantius, after whose death she lived with her brother Honorius at Ravenna. Court intrigues having changed the love of the brother and sister to hatred, Placidia was sent to Constantinople with her two children—Valentinian and Honoria—and was kindly received by her relations. There



were now three illustrious women in the Imperial palace—Pulcheria, Eudocia, and Placidia—and, in consequence of the incompetence and weakness of Theodosius and the death of Honorius, these ladies came to be recognized as the representatives of the Roman Imperial power. The exiles had scarcely settled themselves in Constantinople when messengers arrived from Ravenna with the news that the Emperor Honorius was dead. This event made Theodosius arbiter of the destiny of Rome, for he might now have united the Western Empire with his own. The heir was Valentinian, Placidia's little son, now an exile under the protection of the Byzantine Court, and it would certainly have been quite possible to set aside his claims. Theodosius, however, resisted the temptation, or perhaps he was overruled by the three ladies, and an Imperial and family compact was signed, in consequence of which Placidia received the dignity of Augusta, in order that she might govern the Western Empire in the name of her son; and Valentinian III., a child of five years old, was betrothed to Eudoxia, the infant daughter of Theodosius and Eudocia. The Eastern and Western Empires were thus practically under the rule of women for many years—a circumstance which proved more disastrous in the West than in the East, where, however, there now followed a time of much trouble. Famine, pestilence, earthquakes, fires, and civil and religious strife disturbed the peace of the kingdom as effectually as foreign enemies could have done. In the year 431 Eudocia lost her second daughter, Flaccilla. A famine then occurred in Constantinople, and the populace stoned the Emperor as he went in procession to the corn-magazine; his troops were unsuccessful in Africa, and the army he had sent under the greatest of his generals, Aspar, to the help of the Romans, was beaten by the King of the Vandals.

For several years we know nothing of Eudocia and the Byzantine Court, till, in 437, her only daughter, betrothed when an infant, and now about fifteen years of age, was married with much pomp and ceremony to Valentinian, Emperor of Rome. Athenais thus, as Eudocia, Empress of the East, and her daughter of the West, may be said to have reached the summit of her fortune. She never saw her daughter again, and now, to lessen the sorrow of losing her, or perhaps to gratify the Emperor's pious wishes, she set out on a pilgrimage to Jerusalem.

To this journey Eudocia was, we are told, encouraged by a famous saint—Melana the younger—a Roman lady of high

birth, who, having been at fourteen forced to marry against her inclination, not only adopted a religious life herself, but persuaded her young husband to do so also. They gave their property in Latium to the poor, and themselves travelled about from place to place. Melana, after founding several monasteries in Egypt, settled for a time in Jerusalem. Now it happened that an uncle of hers—Volusianus—was sent to Constantinople to be present at the marriage of the young Emperor Valentinian with the Princess Eudoxia, and he, desiring to see his niece once more, invited Melana to meet him there. Melana accepted the invitation in the hope of being able to convert her uncle, who was still a heathen, to Christianity. When she arrived at Constantinople she found her uncle dangerously ill, which perhaps made her pious mission easier of accomplishment. Volusianus died, and died a Christian. Melana remained some time in order to combat the Nestorian heresy, then rife at Constantinople, and used every effort to induce the Emperor and Empress to renounce the world and give themselves entirely to religion. Her efforts were so far successful that, shortly after this, the Empress decided on making the pilgrimage to the Holy Land.

Before she set out on the journey Eudocia was present at a very interesting scene. On January 23, 438, the relics of St. Chrysostom, an exiled martyr but thirty years before, were brought to Constantinople and interred, with solemn ceremonies and every mark of respect, in the vaults of Constantine and his successors. This tardy recognition of the merits of that celebrated man was perhaps an act of piety in Theodosius, resulting from a desire to atone for the fault of his mother, whose victim St. Chrysostom had been; partly also it may have been a result of Melana's visit, and the stimulus given by her to religious feeling at the Court.

This year was a remarkable one for Theodosius. In this year was concluded the great work which even yet brings his name daily to the lips of scholars, and shows that if he was not a great ruler he was not without some great qualities. In the year 429 Theodosius had instituted a commission, consisting of nine learned men, to collect and arrange the Roman laws and the Imperial constitutions left by Constantine, dividing them according to date and subject, and placing them under appropriate titles. In 435, finding that this commission had made no progress towards accomplishing the great work, he instituted a new one, to which he also gave power to make certain necessary modifications in the constitutions. This work, the celebrated *Codex Theodosianus*, was

con-  
and  
enfo  
Rom  
it in  
tion  
The  
mar

She  
but  
Em  
voic  
poet  
bee  
pilg  
the  
Eud  
men  
thou  
tim  
wer  
betw

Rhe  
sail  
hon  
The  
the  
and  
epic  
gan  
The  
the  
thes  
ther  
his  
fail  
Ant  
inst  
relic

mai  
and  
540

concluded in February 438, and published in Constantinople ; and in January 439 it was accepted by Valentine III. and enforced also in the Roman Empire. It survived the fall of Rome, it gave the Byzantine Empire a decided civil cohesion, it instilled even into barbarous peoples the spirit of civilization and a knowledge of the rights of man, and it secured for Theodosius, weak as he was, a claim to the gratitude of mankind.

Eudocia now started on her pilgrimage to the Holy City. She travelled, however, not in the humble guise of a pilgrim, but with all the pomp and splendour befitting an Oriental Empress. As she sailed through the Archipelago, what siren voices must she not have heard, reminding her of the heroes, poets, sages, and divinities whose homes and haunts had once been in those lovely islands ! But she, a Christian and a pilgrim, must listen to no such memories ; for her they are the voices of evil demons. The gods of Greece were to Eudocia no beautiful beings from the fable-land of poets, no mere images of the fancy. The worship and reverence of thousands of years had given even to the Christians of those times an instinctive belief in their actual existence ; but they were degraded to the rank of evil spirits, the tempters and betrayers of man.

By Lesbos and Chios—the home of Homer—by Samos, Rhodes, and Cyprus—Aphrodite's home—the Imperial pilgrim sailed to Syria, and at Antioch was received with every honour by the citizens of that splendid and flourishing city. The beauty and luxury of Antioch were renowned, and until the rise of Constantinople, it ranked, after Rome and Alexandria, as the third city of the world. Nowhere did the epicure enjoy such feasts ; nowhere were there such extravagant theatrical entertainments as in this city of pleasure. The Antiochans had even bought from the inhabitants of Elis the right of celebrating there the Olympian games, and at these festivals multitudes thronged from far and near to attend them. Julian the Apostate had not, it is true, succeeded in his attempt to resuscitate here the ancient faith ; but his failure cannot be attributed to any great qualities in the Antiochans, who embracing the new religion with ardour, instead of sacrificing to Zeus or Apollo, eagerly adored the relics of saints and martyrs.

Antioch was now in the height of the proud position it maintained till the occurrence of the great earthquake in 526 and the subsequent destruction of the city by the Persians in 540. But even at the time of Eudocia's visit many of the

ancient monuments were in ruins. The temple of Apollo in the Laurel Grove, that marvellous work of Seleucides, had already (362) been destroyed by fire, and the famous oracle had long been silent. In the Myrtle and Laurel Groves at Orontes, where Syrians, Romans, and Greeks had celebrated the feast Majuma, might now be seen Christian tombs and basilicas.

The Church of Antioch, having been founded by St. Peter, ranked before any other ; here the name of Christian was first employed ; here lived Chrysostom ; here Nestorius was educated, here his eloquence made him famous, and here he returned after his fall.

The Empress Eudocia was received with all honour by the Bishop and his clergy, but the Byzantine Chronicles mention only one remarkable occurrence during her visit to Antioch. The daughter of Leontius had not forgotten the beautiful art she had cultivated in the school of the Sophists at Athens. Gathering the citizens of Antioch together, from a golden throne bedecked with precious stones she uttered a grand oration in honour of the famous city whose guest she was. She excited the Antiochans to the highest pitch of enthusiasm when, overpowered with the proud consciousness of her descent, she concluded her speech with Homer's verse—

‘To be of your race and blood—that is my glory !’

What a subject for a master's hand ! Eudocia, the Christian Empress, haranguing the citizens of Antioch, and boasting of her Greek origin.

On leaving the city, the Empress bestowed on it many substantial marks of her favour. Besides many other rich gifts, at her request Theodosius added to the walls and gilded the bronze gates. He had also a fine basilica built there, and statues of himself and Valentinian were erected.

From Antioch, Eudocia travelled by the road marked out for pilgrims, visiting Laodicea, Tripolis, Sidon and Tyre, so famous for delicate fabrics and purple dyes, Ptolemais, and Mount Carmel, to the populous city of Cesarea. There, on entering the Land of Judea, she was received by the Governor and Bishop and Melana, in whose company she made her entrance into Jerusalem. The arrival of the Empress must have been a great event in Palestine, for though the Holy Land was visited by countless pilgrims from every part of the world, no Emperor or Empress had been seen there since the

visit of Helena, the mother of Constantine. Here, in the small city of Jerusalem, there was nothing that would have been attractive to Athenais—nothing Greek, no historical monuments, no beautiful works of art, no schools of learning. But Eudocia must have imbibed much of Melana's spirit—the faith which found beauty and interest in bare rocks if they had been trodden by Jesus and His disciples, the faith which could rejoice in renunciation and self-denial.

The Empress remained a year in Jerusalem, living in a nunnery, perhaps the one presided over by Melana, whom Eudocia seems to have revered as her spiritual mother. She was present at the feast of the dedication of the church erected by Melana on Mount Calvary, and of course, like other pilgrims, she would visit all the sacred places in and near Jerusalem, and adore the relics of the Passion shown in the Church of the Sepulchre. According to a well-known legend, Helena found the Cross of Christ uninjured in the year 326, and its genuineness was attested by so many miracles that no pious Christian could doubt it. This precious relic was kept by the Bishop with jealous care in the Church of the Sepulchre, and so generous was he in giving to pilgrims fragments of it (receiving gold in return) that the last atom of the cross would very shortly have disappeared if it had not possessed the wonderful power of self-renewal. Constantine himself had carried off a portion of it as a talisman, as well as several of the nails, which also possessed the same marvellous power. These relics were, in fact, a source of great wealth to the Church. Every pilgrim desired to take home with him some relic, and these were manufactured according to the demand. Oil from the lamps burning in the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, pictures of the Madonna and Child, given out to be the works of Saint Luke or an Angel, were readily bought. Eudocia received many gifts of this kind from Bishop Juvenalis, all which she recompensed with imperial generosity. Among them were several relics of the Martyr St. Stephen, in whose church she had been baptized, and on her return to Constantinople she placed them in the Basilica of St. Laurentius.

But the most remarkable memorials of her pilgrimage to the Holy Land were two chains, with which she firmly believed King Herod had chained the Apostle Peter. Half of these precious relics she gave to the Church of the Apostles in Constantinople, the other half she presented to her daughter Eudoxia, who built at Rome a church in which to keep them. This church was first called after its foundress, 'Titulus

Eudoxiæ,' and afterwards 'Sancti Petri ad Vincula.' There the chains of St. Peter have been preserved with due reverence to the present day, for more than fourteen hundred years; and there, on August 1 every year, they are still exhibited intact, although during all this period the Pope has sent splinters of them as amulets to wealthy believers in all parts of the Christian world.

The pilgrimage to Jerusalem formed an epoch in Eudocia's life. It had a religious significance for her as a Christian, such as the initiation into the Eleusinian mysteries had for a pagan. Even at the Holy Sepulchre she would encounter worldly vices—ambition, discontent, envy, and avarice; but in spite of all these the prevailing spirit of Jerusalem touched her heart, and here doubtless Athenais first became a Christian in earnest, or she would not have chosen Jerusalem, as she afterwards did, for her last asylum. She probably, however, had no thought when she left it on her homeward journey that in this very city she would end her days.

The Empress returned to her husband at Constantinople in the year 439, and found matters at the Court there little altered. Pulcheria's influence was supreme, and Paulinus was high in the favour of the Emperor. There was only one important change—namely, the appearance of a new favourite named Chrysaphius. This person's handsome face and crafty character had so won the Emperor's fancy that he gained extraordinary power. The Byzantine Chronicles now lose themselves in confused histories of Court intrigues, more or less impossible or improbable. But, though we may not be able to discover the precise truth as to the causes that led to it, the fact is certain that soon after her return from Palestine the Empress fell a victim to Court intrigues. In the marriage of her daughter and the pilgrimage to the Holy Land Eudocia reached the highest point of her fortune, and from this time it steadily and swiftly declined. Perhaps she had grown too independent and ambitious to submit quietly to the ascendancy of Pulcheria in the palace. However that might be, she discovered that she had lost the affection of the Emperor, and desired to be allowed to retire to Jerusalem. The Byzantines have a wonderful story of an apple bought by the Emperor, presented by him to the Empress, and given by her to Paulinus; but this is so evidently a fable after the fashion of the *Arabian Nights* that it is not worth repeating, and has been rejected by all writers of authority.

The second journey of Eudocia to Jerusalem took place probably about the year 443. It was either voluntary, or was

made  
velled  
conte  
of he  
when  
conne  
here  
temp  
Chro  
of the

'P  
the E  
I kno  
by th  
death  
depriv  
there

T  
pictu  
truth  
two e  
by th  
took  
salem  
visite  
her in  
and c  
of he  
Eudc  
the c  
gate  
under  
posse  
again  
was t  
a boy  
amus  
Emp  
the h  
riage  
Emp  
both.  
seize  
put t



made to have that appearance before the world. She travelled this time also with all honour as an Empress. But contemporaries said little about her when she was at the height of her glory, and she almost disappears from the moment when, by retreating to Jerusalem, she cut herself off from all connexion with historical events. Some unconnected words here and there by a few writers are all that remain of contemporary notices; but Marcellinus (sixth century) in his *Chronicles* has the following passage when relating the events of the year 444:

'Presbyter Severus and Deacon John, who were in the service of the Empress Eudocia in the town of Ælia, had been put to death, I know not for what cause, by Saturninus, one of the body-guard sent by the Emperor Theodosius, and Eudocia ordered the immediate death of Saturninus. She was instantly by her husband's order deprived of all her Imperial splendour, and she went to Jerusalem, there to die.'

These words, curt and few, suddenly change and distort the picture hitherto so soft and beautiful. We cannot doubt the truth of the account given by Marcellinus, for the death of the two ecclesiastics is mentioned by other historians, and ascribed by them to the Emperor's jealousy. They say that Eudocia took Presbyter Severus and Deacon John with her to Jerusalem, and that the Emperor, learning that they had frequently visited the Empress when in Constantinople, were still with her in Jerusalem, and received many presents from her, wrote and commanded them to be put to death. The violent death of her faithful servants so worked on the outraged feelings of Eudocia, that she forgot alike the principles of philosophy and the commands of Christianity, and had the Emperor's delegate at once put to death. Theodosius had indeed fallen under the influence of evil spirits. The demon of jealousy possessed him, and turned him not only against his wife, but against the friend and companion of his youth, Paulinus. This was the son of one of the Byzantine nobility who had been as a boy made the companion of Theodosius in his studies and amusements. They had been the greatest friends, and the Emperor, in order to keep Paulinus about him, had given him the highest offices in the palace. At the time of the marriage Paulinus made himself most useful to the Emperor and Empress, and he was long the faithful servant and friend of both. But now Court intrigues, or some unworthy infatuation, seized on Theodosius. Eudocia was banished and Paulinus put to death. That there was some connexion between the

two events seems evident, and the Emperor's jealousy is mentioned as the cause, but no proof or evidence can be found, and Eudocia on her deathbed is said to have asserted her innocence. Pulcheria too, after all her devotion to her brother, and after having wielded for so many years the real power of the Empire, was obliged to retire into private life, and the Emperor fell entirely under the influence of the unworthy favourite Chrysaphius. Trouble after trouble at this time befell the Empire, and contemporary historians do not hesitate to describe the ravages of the Huns and Vandals as the scourge of God for the sins of its rulers. But Theodosius was not destined to a long life. In the year 450 he was thrown from his horse, receiving such injuries that he died in a few days, and Pulcheria was immediately proclaimed Empress.

After the death of Theodosius Eudocia continued to live quietly at Jerusalem, and seems to have taken considerable part in the religious disputes then raging in that city. Her relations with the Byzantine Court became more friendly. Pulcheria seems to have become reconciled to her, and she evidently had some intercourse with her relations. Her brothers now appear again, and Valerius is mentioned particularly, and in a way that shows him to have occupied an important position.

Pulcheria had no longer any cause for jealousy with regard to her sister-in-law, and perhaps regret for her brother, pity for the exile, and memories of the past may have softened her heart, but she did not live long to show the change. Ælia Pulcheria, one of the most remarkable women of Byzantine history, died September 10, 453, leaving all her property to the poor. Churches, hospitals, and orphan asylums were the monuments she left behind her in Constantinople. The Council of Chalcedon published her fame as defender of the orthodox faith against heresy, and Pope Leo, the one great man in that time of miserable divisions and shameful contests, called her a 'protective power raised up by God for the safety of His Church.' Leo himself corresponded with her, and his letters to her may still be read with interest. We also have letters from Leo to Eudocia, but not during the time of her power. Leo did not ascend the papal chair till 440—that is, just before her fall. The two letters we have from him to Eudocia are both dated June 453. The first relates to the time of the feast of Easter; the second urges Eudocia to endeavour to gain over the monks in Palestine from their heresy, and enjoins submission to the decisions of the Chalcedonian Council. The

Pope is careful not to hurt Eudocia's feelings. He makes as if he had not the slightest doubt of her right feeling, and hopes that good may come to Christendom from her having been led to take up her abode in the very place where witnesses of the Passion had proclaimed the Saviour as God and Man in one Person. But the letter is brief and cold, and some of the usual titles are omitted from the address. The Emperor Valentinian, too, was urged by Pope Leo to persuade Eudocia, his mother-in-law, to accept the orthodox formula of belief. It was not, however, till three years after this that Eudocia at last yielded to the representations of the Pope and the Roman Court, and then it was only in consequence of a dreadful tragedy which destroyed the happiness of her only daughter. Eudoxia, through her marriage with the weak and vicious Valentinian III., was Empress of the West, but without the power or splendour of her predecessors. She had to live in the miserable town of Ravenna, and witness the feeble government of her mother-in-law, and the wickedness of her husband, while the Roman Empire lost one province after another to the barbarians. Then, when the Imperial Court moved to Rome, and the vices and passions of Valentinian made him universally detested, he was assassinated (March 16, A.D. 455), and Eudoxia at the age of thirty-three was left a widow. The senator Maximus, whom just affronts had made the murderer of Valentinian, then forced Eudoxia to become his wife, and gave her eldest daughter to his son. This terrible position, which she had no power to resist, made any way of deliverance seem desirable, and she actually called to her assistance Genseric, King of the Vandals, the great enemy of her country. Genseric listened gladly to her appeal, and landed with his army at Portus in May 455. When he approached Rome, the Romans rose and killed Maximus and his son. Genseric spared the city and the life of the citizens, but he gave the city over to plunder for fourteen days, and on departing he took with him the Empress Eudoxia and her two daughters. When the news reached Jerusalem, and Eudocia heard of the assassination of her son-in-law the Emperor, the insult and imprisonment of her daughter the Empress, and her two grand-daughters, her spirit seemed utterly crushed. The priests hastened to her, and used the favourable opportunity for their own purposes, persuading her that all this sorrow had befallen her family as a punishment from Heaven for her obstinate refusal to submit to the decision of the Chalcedonian Council. They implored her to propitiate the Almighty by her conversion to the Catholic

faith. Bishop Anastasius, and the other ecclesiastics in Jerusalem, importuned her so long and so persistently that at last she sent to the most famous saint of that time to ask the truth or error of her faith. This was St. Simon Stylites, a man of ideal holiness, but also of ideal folly and fanaticism. When a shepherd boy in Sicily he followed an inward call and adopted the life of a hermit, and after many years' apprenticeship in the art of asceticism he attained an unapproachable proficiency. At last, in order to escape from the dangerous homage of the crowds that streamed from Syria, Persia, Armenia, Greece, and Rome, and even from the country of the barbarians, to see his face, touch his garments, and receive his blessing, he contrived a most extraordinary place of refuge. He erected, about thirty miles from Antioch, a pillar, at first nine feet high, but gradually raised till it reached the height of sixty feet. Here he lived for thirty years, defying the summer heat and winter cold, and here he died, asserting that on this dangerous height he was nearer heaven, and could hear the voices of the angels! All night long he might be seen praying, with his arms outstretched, looking upward to the stars.

The influence of this man on ecclesiastical affairs was extraordinary, even in that superstitious age. The highest personages sought his mediation and advice in the most important concerns of the Church and State; it was therefore not unnatural that Eudocia should consult him. How Simon carried on the conversation with Eudocia's messengers we know not, but he read Eudocia's letter, and wrote an answer with his own hand. This curious letter still remains; it is written in Greek, and runs thus:

'Know, oh daughter, that the devil, who is well aware of the treasure of thy virtues, haunts thee in order to sift thee like wheat. Theodosius, the instrument of the Evil One, has spread darkness over thy God-loving soul and plunged thee in perplexity. But fear not, thy faith shall not be overcome. But I am amazed that thou shouldst come so far to seek water, who hast a well close at hand didst thou but know it. I speak of the godly man Euthymius. Follow his direction and command, and thou shalt be saved.'

Euthymius was a grey-headed seer, the greatest miracle-worker in Palestine, and the only one among the hermits there who had remained aloof from all heretical doctrines. He lived a few miles from Jerusalem, in a *laura*, or circle of cells, and Eudocia caused a wooden tower to be built for him on a hill at a little distance, in order that she might converse with the pious sage without interruption. Euthymius at last con-

188  
vin  
dec  
Co  
bec  
into  
cul  
ben  
from  
tem  
tha  
mar  
the  
Eud  
poo  
outs  
had  
mus  
thos  
peri  
Wit  
lang  
and  
cal  
total  
The  
arra  
I  
of  
toget  
phra  
Mose  
Zach  
that  
the g  
faith  
work  
mann  
writte  
Justin  
happ  
are n  
1 p  
to whi  
Germa  
VOI

vinced the Empress of her errors, and in the year 456 she decided to renounce them and accept the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon.

The last years of Eudocia were uneventful, and must have been sad and dreary. Separated from her friends and from intercourse with the great world, far from all the influences of culture and art, she turned her energies to works of piety and benevolence, and these she extended alike to those who differed from, and those who agreed with, her. It was said by contemporary writers that she did more for the city of Jerusalem than even the Empress Helena; and it is very possible that many of her works were afterwards placed to the credit of the greater name of the mother of Constantine the Great. Eudocia rebuilt the walls of the city, founded houses for the poor, and monasteries, built the Church of St. Stephen just outside Jerusalem, and a residence for the Bishop. But she had another consolation beside the duties of religion; the muses had not quite forsaken her, and there is no doubt that those of her poems that have come down to us date from this period. Her poetry, however, had lost its strength and vigour. With Greek philosophy had vanished all true poetic fire; the language alone remained, and even that had lost its purity; and her poems, like all others of that period, are cold rhetorical exercises—full of classic images and expressions, but totally wanting in the inspiration and brilliancy of genius. They exhibit no creative power, but much artistic skill in the arrangement and management of their composition.

Eudocia clothed sacred histories in the language and verse of Homer, and mingled subjects Christian and heathen, together indifferently. Her best-known work was the *Paraphrase of the Octateuch*, or the translation of the five books of Moses, Joshua, Judges, and Ruth, and afterwards Daniel and Zacharias. In the ninth century the learned Photius declared that he had read these works of the Empress Eudocia with the greatest pleasure, that the translation was elegant and faithful, and that he was only amazed that such a beautiful work could have proceeded from a lady of her rank and manner of life. Photius especially praises a poem of Eudocia's, written in hexameters—the 'Life of the Martyrs Cyprianus and Justina.'<sup>1</sup> All her other poems have disappeared, but of this happily the first and second books have been preserved, and are nearly, if not quite, perfect. This poem is the history of

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Gregorovius has added to his interesting history of Athenais—to which we must again acknowledge our obligations—a translation into German of the second book of 'Cyprianus and Justina.'

the beautiful Justina of Antioch. She is beloved by a heathen youth Aglaides, who, finding all his attempts to gain her affections useless, goes to the famous magician Cyprian, to entreat his assistance. In vain did the magician summon the powers of hell to his aid: Justina dispersed them all with the sign of the cross. Her persistent faith at last overcomes Cyprian, who is himself in love with the beautiful Christian, and he abjures the evil spirits and is baptized. At first he is made a door-keeper in the church, but in course of time he becomes Bishop of Antioch. In the second book of this poem Eudocia describes Cyprian's life before he became a Christian, according to his own account as given, after his conversion, by himself. He relates how he travelled about to learn the arts of magic and obtain power over the evil spirits, how he had been convinced by Justina's faith, and had fallen again into unbelief, how he was rescued by the good priest Eusebius, taken to his house and cared for with all love and kindness, and how he then became a Christian in reality, burned his books of magic publicly in the church, and gave all he possessed to the poor. The third book relates the sorrows and death of Cyprian and Justina. Both were victims of the persecution under Diocletian. They underwent terrible sufferings in prison with such fortitude and patience that the judge, not knowing how further to torture them, sent them before the tribunal of Diocletian. That Emperor ordered them to be beheaded on the banks of the river Gallus. Their relics were secretly obtained and brought away by boatmen to Rome, where the pious matron, Rufina, had a beautiful church erected to receive them and perpetuate the memory of the martyrs. This remarkable legend, one of the most beautiful of that time of conflicts, when Christianity, victorious, had already given the death-blow to Paganism, must have affected Eudocia very deeply. She herself had gone through much of the same suffering and trial, and there is no doubt that the experiences of Cyprian are in reality the experiences of Athenais. This poem gives Eudocia a claim to literary fame, for she here first uses a legend, whose deep inner thought supplied the germ from which Dante and Goethe have produced immortal poems. In it there are tones and touches which reappear in the poems of Dante and Milton, while, more than twelve hundred years after Eudocia, Calderon made use of the same material for his tragedy *El Magico prodigioso*, never dreaming that he had been forestalled by a Byzantine Empress.

Athenais the philosopher's daughter from Athens, Eudocia



the Byzantine Empress, died at Jerusalem, protesting her innocence with regard to Paulinus. She was buried in the Church of St. Stephen, which she had founded. The year of her death is not quite certain, but it probably took place in 460. Her age also is disputed, some writers making her fifty-nine and others sixty-seven when she died.

---

#### ART. V.—THE EARLY CHRISTIAN MINISTRY AND THE DIDACHÉ.

1. *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel; nebst Untersuchungen zur ältesten Geschichte der Kirchenverfassung und des Kirchenrechts.* Von ADOLF HARNACK. (Leipzig, 1884.) (Forming Heft i. of Band ii. of Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur.*)

In the January number of this Review it fell to our lot to enter a very decided protest against one of the latest modern misrepresentations of the early history of Christianity, and we took occasion to point out in particular the very one-sided and erroneous conception of the genesis of the ministry there portrayed. We propose in the present article to complete our position by the development of a constructive theory based on all the available evidence, with special reference to the lately-acquired *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*. It is a real relief to turn from the task of exposing the shallow superficiality of the modern bookwriter to the problems of critical inquiry into our authorities themselves.

Few ages have been so industrious or so successful as our own, whether in the accumulation of new documents or in the appreciation of the results to be deduced from them. The Short Syriac Ignatius, the complete Epistle of Barnabas, the complete Epistles of Clement in Greek and in Syriac, the complete Clementine Homilies, the Greek of Hermas, and, last but not least, the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, these are but specimens of the additions to our knowledge of the extra-canonical literature of the first and second centuries made within the last fifty years. Nor have there been wanting critics competent to absorb this wealth of new material

into the mass of the already extant evidence. But the most acute critic—and the more original his powers the more certain the inference—is not able wholly and at once to free himself from the distortion of vision produced by the glamour of a new discovery; the whole foreground is occupied by it at the moment, and hasty conclusions as to its importance are apt to precede exhaustive inquiry into its real value. For a whole generation after Cureton's discovery of Ignatius a very exaggerated conception of its merits prevailed, which has been only gradually correcting itself by the lapse of time. Quite similarly the publication by Archbishop Bryennios in 1883 of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*,<sup>1</sup> an undoubted fragment of primitive Christianity, was accompanied in many quarters by a disposition to see in it the only clue to the development of Church organization, just as the Tübingen speculators had found the key to the doctrinal history of Christianity in the pseudo-Clementine literature, and in it alone. None of the numerous editors<sup>2</sup> has succumbed more completely to this temptation than Professor Harnack, whose book must certainly have suffered from the haste with which it followed Bryennios' *editio princeps*, for the one was published late in 1883 and the other followed in 1884. It is marvellous how any man can have put together such copious notes, and still more such elaborate prolegomena, in so short a space of time. Probably few men but Harnack could have done it at all; and it is therefore no matter of surprise that the views he boldly enunciated need modification almost day by day, as continuous research and maturer judgment formulate their results. The editor, in fact, seemed to believe, although he placed the *Teaching* at so late a date as from A.D. 135 to A.D. 165 (mainly on the strength of its supposed relation to Barnabas and Hermas),<sup>3</sup> that it preserves the only trustworthy

<sup>1</sup> The manuscript, whose discovery at Constantinople will permanently enshrine the name of the Archbishop among those of the greatest modern benefactors of the study of ecclesiastical history, contained also the Epistle of Barnabas, the two Epistles of Clement, the interpolated revision of the Ignatian Epistles, and St. Chrysostom's Synopsis. The Epistles of Clement were published in 1875.

The *Teaching* is divided by the editors into sixteen chapters, of which h 1-5 deal with the Teachings of the Two Ways of Life and Death; ch. 5 with Meats; ch. 7 with Baptism; ch. 8 with Fasting and Prayer; ch. 9, 10 with Thanksgiving or Eucharist; ch. 11-13 with Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, and the relation of the community to them and to other visitors; ch. 15 with Bishops and Deacons; ch. 16 with the Second Coming.

<sup>2</sup> We can already number in England Dr. Taylor, Dean Spence, and Mr. de Romestin; in America, Dr. Schaff; in France, M. Sabatier.

<sup>3</sup> It is fair to note here that in Dr. Harnack's latest pronouncement on

picture of the early Christian ministry outside the First Epistle to the Corinthians and the *Shepherd* of Hermas. Now, since the former is assigned unanimously to about the year 57 A.D., and Harnack prefers for the latter a date about A.D. 140, there is an interval of eighty years, the whole of the available literature of which—including the Epistle to the Ephesians, the Pastoral Epistles, the Acts, the Epistle of Clement, the Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp—is passed over in comparative silence in the interests of a document like the Teaching, maintained here to be of a later date than any of them. Yet of course even those who deny the actual genuineness of one or other of these works must accept them as valid witnesses for their own time. Certainly it may often happen that of any two documents the later represents the earlier state of things, and we believe it to be more or less true of the Teaching compared with some of the rest of our authorities; but so complete an inversion of chronological relations as Harnack's is an impossibility. Either the date must be thrown many decades back or the deference paid to the evidence must be less unconditional. We believe that we can show reasons for accepting not only one but both of these solutions.

Commencing with the external relations of the Teaching, even if we concede that Harnack is right in asserting its dependence on the Epistle of Barnabas and the *Shepherd* of Hermas, he has dated the Teaching thirty years unnecessarily too late. Of course if either Barnabas or Hermas is to be brought down as far as A.D. 140 the Teaching on this supposition must be later still. But if the first decade of the second century is, as we are fully convinced it is, the latest point for either, then the Teaching may belong to A.D. 120 rather than to A.D. 135-165.

In point of fact, however, his assumptions, rather cavalierly made, have never been allowed to pass unchallenged. It was significant enough that he himself admitted that what in Barnabas are a mere confused medley of disjointed precepts (ch. xix. xx.) become in the Teaching (ch. i.-v.) an ordered and consistent code of elementary morality. Nor is the presumption thus raised at all affected by a comparison of in-

the Teaching, which has just come into our hands in the shape of a small pamphlet entitled *Die Apostellehre* (Leipzig, 1886), his views are so far modified as (1) to admit a date A.D. 120-150, rather than 135-165; (2) to accept the common Jewish original of Barnabas and the Teaching (see below). But we have preferred to confine ourselves in the text to the more elaborate work, in which alone he applies his results to the history of the Christian ministry, and produces a consistent theory.

dividual passages. We will only call attention to one parallel, which has always seemed to us decisive in itself:—

Did. iv. 11, 12. 'Thou shalt not rebuke thy slave or handmaiden, that hope on the same God, in thy bitterness. . . but ye, slaves, shall be subject to your masters as representing God in reverence and fear.'

Barn. xix. 7. 'Thou shalt be subject to masters as representing God in reverence and fear. Thou shalt not rebuke thy slave or handmaiden in bitterness, that hope on the same God. . .'

That the individual Christian who is the subject of exhortation in the Teaching should be reminded of his duties towards his slaves, and that then by an easy transition the writer should turn to the slaves and remind them of their duty to their masters, is natural enough. It is not natural that Barnabas should assume his individual hearer to be in the first sentence a slave and in the next a master; nor that, while as a slave his masters are spoken of in the plural, as a master his slaves are spoken of in the singular. It is not natural, but it is explicable when once we assume the Teaching as his basis. He has simply inverted the sentences and omitted the change of subject.

Yet we must not too hastily conclude that, because the Teaching is certainly not copying Barnabas, the converse is therefore the case, and Barnabas must be drawing directly from the Teaching. It is still possible that both of them utilized a common source. If Barnabas incorporates the greater part of the first five chapters of the Teaching (the manual of the Two Ways), what he leaves is as noteworthy as what he takes. Part of ch. i. (§§ 3–5) is the only large section of these chapters which is in the main definitely Christian, being dependent for the most part on the Gospel narrative of the Sermon on the Mount; and Barnabas has nothing corresponding to it. Similarly where the Teaching (iii. 7) has attached to the 'Be meek' the Gospel beatitude 'for the meek shall inherit the earth,' Barnabas (xix. 4) has the command without the promise. And if the one writes (Did. iv. 14), 'In church thou shalt confess thy transgressions, and shalt not come to thy prayer in an evil conscience,' the other (Barn. xix. 12) has simply, 'Thou shalt confess thy sins and shalt not come to prayer in an evil conscience,' omitting 'in church,' and instead of 'thy prayer' having 'prayer' (*proseucha*, the word for a Jewish prayer-meeting, Acts xvi. 13). It is incredible that a Christian author should have carefully set himself to exclude just what was Christian, and the deduction is irresistible that

the Two Ways in the form from which Barnabas drew contained no Christian elements and was, in other words, a purely Jewish compilation;<sup>1</sup> and we ought to be able tentatively to restore this common source by taking as our basis the first five chapters of the Teaching (which, as we have seen, preserve a more original arrangement than Barnabas) and eliminating what is only Christian. The hypothesis is confirmed by an examination of the framework which results. The Golden Rule is quoted in its negative form, and the exegesis consists, as in the Decalogue, almost entirely of prohibitions. The need felt of a morality more advanced than that of the Ten Commandments in their literal interpretation is compensated, not by the full Evangelical doctrine, but by the Jewish expedient of 'a fence to the law;' the third chapter, 'Flee from evil and all that is like unto it,' being an attempt, sometimes highly artificial, to range the 'little sins' under the heads of the grosser vices to which they 'lead.'

Are we, then, to confine the influence of a Jewish original to the first section of the Teaching, or can it be traced underlying any of the rest of the treatise? It is true that, with one exception, Barnabas has nothing in common with the later chapters; but any presumption thus raised is more than counterbalanced by the internal evidence afforded by the Teaching itself. That the whole is saturated with Jewish modes of thought is clear, and Dr. Salmon,<sup>2</sup> following up Dr. Taylor's lead, suggests that, besides the Two Ways, the next section also (ch. vi.-x.), treating of Meats, Baptism, Fasting, Prayer, and *Eucharistia* or Thanksgiving, is based on the same Jewish source. Putting aside for a moment the last, the subjects are those which we should expect to be treated in a handbook for the use of proselytes, such as our Jewish original probably was. Meats offered to idols would be rigor-

<sup>1</sup> This, the most weighty contribution yet made to the criticism of the Teaching, was first worked out in Dr. Taylor's Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution in May and June 1885, and now reprinted. They contain besides an immense amount of valuable illustration of the whole book from Jewish sources.

What, then, was the motive which led to the rather incongruous insertion in the Teaching of the Christian section (i. 3-5), with its exhortations to forgiveness of enemies? Besides the general feeling that the Jewish standard of the Two Ways did not fully satisfy the claims of Christianity, a comparison with St. Matthew will explain why this special point was chosen; for the injunction of forgiveness in that Gospel is our Lord's comment on the defective morality which proclaimed, 'Thou shalt love thy neighbour (cf. *Did.* i. 2) and hate thine enemy.'

<sup>2</sup> In his *Non-Canonical Books*, or appendix to his *Introduction to the New Testament*.

ously forbidden. Baptism was the indispensable method of initiation. Prayer and fasting (almsgiving had been already spoken of in chap. iv.) would be the special duties inculcated. Of course the hand of the editor is more prominently visible here than in the earlier chapters. Christian baptism must be administered with the Gospel formula. Christian prayer must start from the Lord's Prayer. But the distinctions between running and other water, or cold and warm, the fasts twice a week, the prayers three times a day, these are all of Jewish character. And if we read, 'But let your fasts not be with the hypocrites, for they fast on the second day of the week and on the fifth; but do ye fast the fourth day and the preparation' (*i.e.* Wednesday and Friday): 'neither pray ye as the hypocrites, but as the Lord commanded' (then comes the Lord's Prayer), the turn of the sentence goes a long way to suggest that the fasts and prayers of the 'hypocrites,' or Pharisees, were what the writer had before him in his model.

The phenomena of the Eucharistic chapters are not quite so simple. But if we consider that the Sacrament has its own proper mention in connexion with the Sunday services in ch. xiv., where, though the same verb, *εὐχαριστέω*, 'to give thanks,' is used, it is defined further as 'breaking of bread' and 'Sacrifice'; next that in the formulæ before us there is no trace of Eucharistic doctrine (not to speak of the Institution), which was already an unvarying portion of the Christian tradition when St. Paul wrote to the Corinthians (*παρέλαβον . . . παρέδωκα*, I Cor. xi. 23); then, again, that the transposition of the cup and the bread contradicts all the earliest evidence—that of St. Paul, St. Matthew, and St. Mark—and at best receives only a doubtful support from St. Luke: we shall be reluctant to believe that it is a question here of Sacramental consecration at all. We prefer to accept the hypothesis that we have here substantially Jewish benedictions of meals, intended possibly by the editor for use at the *Agape*; the only difficulty that we can see in the way of this view is the use of the term *Eucharistia*, and that does not seem to have acquired its technical meaning exclusively from the first. By omitting, then, the manifestly Christian interpolations—the insertion 'through Jesus Christ' in each sentence and the two prayers for the gathering of the Church—we ought to approach to the original.

'[First concerning the cup.] We thank Thee, O our Father, for the holy vine of David Thy servant, which Thou hast made known unto us. Thine be the glory for ever.

'[And concerning the broken bread.] We thank Thee, O our



Father, for the life and knowledge which Thou hast made known unto us. Thine be the glory for ever.

[And after being filled.] We thank Thee, Holy Father, for Thy holy Name, which Thou hast made to dwell in our hearts, and for the knowledge and faith and immortality which Thou hast made known unto us. Thine be the glory for ever.

'Thou, Lord Almighty, hast created all things for Thy name's sake, and hast given food and drink to men for enjoyment, that they may thank Thee; and to us Thou hast given spiritual food and drink and life eternal. Before all we thank Thee that Thou art powerful. Thine be the glory for ever.'<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Salmon doubts whether the Jewish basis extends beyond this point; but, not to speak of the presumption that if two-thirds of a book has one source the last third will have the same, there is the fact that Barnabas has a sentence in common with the last chapter, and it is surely more likely that he should have copied one more sentence from the original of both than that the Teaching should, as Dr. Salmon is obliged to hold, have known Barnabas, have quoted him, and yet have quoted him only once. No doubt these final chapters are very much more altered and amplified than the earlier. Yet we know that the Jews had 'apostles,' or messengers of the chief priests, and that among their functions was the collection of tribute money, &c., for Jerusalem;<sup>2</sup> and if the original contained instructions about these officers this would, as Dr. Salmon himself acutely suggests, account for the reason assigned in our Teaching for the payment of the firstfruits to the prophets, 'for *they* are your high priests.' Again, it is not likely that any Jewish manual would be wholly devoid of instructions about the Sabbath. Here too, if

<sup>1</sup> One or two points may be noted in the above, which does not pretend to be more than approximate, being attained merely by eliminations, where elimination was possible without alteration.

- (1) The doxology in the four prayers retained is in each case 'Thine be the glory for ever;' in the two Christian prayers eliminated, as in the Lord's Prayer, it is 'Thine be the power and the glory for ever.'
- (2) May not the 'holy vine of David' simply be 'the cup of salvation' of Ps. cxvi. 13 (see the Rabbinical passage adduced in illustration by Dr. Taylor, *ad loc.*), just as corresponding thanks are offered in the next prayer but one for 'the name of the Lord'?
- (3) The first prayer in its Christian form ('David Thy servant,' 'Jesus Thy servant') finds an interesting parallel in the earliest recorded Christian prayer, Acts iv. 25-27.
- (4) For the Christian-sounding phrase 'spiritual food and drink,' Sabatier, quite independently, assigns a Jewish origin.

<sup>2</sup> See Lightfoot's *Galatians*, 'On the Name and Office of an Apostle.'

the Sunday has replaced the Sabbath in ch. xiv., the curious phrase 'the Lord's day of the Lord' is only the Christian substitute for the Jewish 'Sabbath of the Lord.' And, lastly, in an age when Jewish thought was so largely eschatological, a description of the Last Things would have formed a not unfitting close; and this is introduced (xvi. 2) by an appeal to 'more frequent assembling together'<sup>1</sup> (it is this which is common also to Barnabas, iv. 10), which, if the greater part of ch. xiv. xv. is Christian, perhaps connected itself in the original immediately with the command to 'assemble together' on the Sabbath. Parts of the final chapter are certainly additions, such as the last clause of all; but parts are certainly Jewish, and in particular the difficult *σημεῖον ἐκπετάσεως*, or 'sign of outspreading' (of which Archdeacon Palmer's 'sign of the Cross' is the only tolerable interpretation yet given; Harnack passes it over), might then be, as has been suggested to us by an Oriental scholar, a mistranslation of the Hebrew *perishūth*, 'sign of a marvel,' since that word bears in neo-Hebrew both senses of 'an outstretching' and 'a wonder.'

Of course if we are right in our contention that the Teaching is a *réchauffé* of a purely Jewish manual two results follow. In the first place the value of the Teaching is so far diminished that no stress can be laid on its negative evidence; it would naturally treat only of such subjects as were contained in (or at least suggested by) its original, so as to present to the convert a form as nearly as possible resembling that which had been familiar to the proselyte. The omissions are thus explicable which have been noticed in relation to the Laying on of hands and of Anointing, rites, as we know from the Epistles (Heb. vi. 1, James v. 14), familiar to Jewish Christians. And secondly, if Barnabas copied not our book, but the original, it follows that the date of two works which simply draw from one stock need bear no relation to one another. We are, therefore, thrown back on the internal indications of the Teaching, and we propose to follow on a smaller scale the example of Professor Harnack, and attempt to arrive at some conclusion by means of a general inquiry into the early history of the ministry, allotting to the Teaching an approximate date in accordance with its more or less advanced stage of

<sup>1</sup> Ignatius (*Polyc.* iv.) has a phrase rather like the form in the Teaching. A Bishop of Antioch is just the sort of person who might have known the work, since its present form is beyond possibility of doubt Syrian; and in *Magn.* iv. v. vi. several resemblances occur; 'To be gathered together according to the command.' 'Since then the world has an end, and the two together, death and life, lie before us' (*Did.* xvi.). 'The type of God' (*Did.* iv.).

dev  
Har  
who  
wor  
men  
we  
a re  
of t  
con:  
foot  
lines  
any  
Earl  
nack  
He s  
men

'the  
which  
impo  
apost  
out o

It m  
scop  
belie  
conce

T  
so of  
most  
pione  
vidua  
in so  
Engl  
this r  
direct  
for m  
the v  
before  
proph  
allusio  
plaine  
Ephes

Y  
close c  
study,

development. The appendix of seventy pages in which Harnack has amassed nearly all of what we know on the whole subject down to the year 170 A.D. is the most noteworthy feature of his edition, and possesses some remarkable merits as well as some remarkable defects. It is, so far as we are aware, the first attempt which has been made to give a really comprehensive review of the evidence. The history of the 'local' ministry, of the episcopi, presbyters, and deacons, has been investigated with great care by Bishop Lightfoot in his *Essay on the Christian Ministry*,<sup>1</sup> and on other lines by Dr. Hatch in his *Bampton Lectures*; but scarcely anything is said by either of the 'general' ministry of the Early Church, the apostles, prophets, and teachers, while Harnack has devoted to this side nearly two-thirds of his inquiry. He seems to us to have struck the true keynote of the development of the episcopate when he concludes (p. 145) that

'the episcopi of the individual community owe the high position which they finally attained mainly to the circumstance that the most important functions of the ministers of the Church at large—the apostles, prophets, and teachers—in course of time, as these died out or lost their significance, passed over to them.'

It may safely be predicted that this explanation of the episcopate can never be neglected by any future writer, and we believe that it will oust all the more partial and more limited conceptions which have hitherto prevailed.

This in itself is high praise. But unfortunately it seems so often to happen in the case of German writers that the most admirable and persevering industry, the most valuable pioneering work, even the most acute interpretation of individual phenomena, may coincide with a lamentable deficiency in soundness of judgment, or, to put it more pointedly, in English common sense. Professor Harnack is no exception to this rule, and his failure may be illustrated in more than one direction. We ought not, indeed, to blame him too severely for magnifying unreasonably the importance of phenomena, the very existence of which he has been the first to bring before our notice; but it may be said with truth that he has prophets on the brain, and is perfectly prepared to find an allusion to that order in every recondite or hitherto unexplained passage. For instance, in the letter of Polycrates of Ephesus to Victor of Rome in 195 A.D. (Eus. *H. E.* v. 24) he

<sup>1</sup> Yet even there there are important lines of evidence, such as the close connexion between the bishops and deacons, which ought to repay study, of which no account is taken.

notes that Melito of Sardis is described as 'he that walked in the Holy Spirit,' and that the same expression is also used by the writer of the daughters of Philip the Apostle. Now all of these are elsewhere characterized as possessing the prophetic gift, and Harnack therefore divines that Polycrates is employing a circumlocution to avoid the term 'prophet,' which would have fallen into disfavour with the Catholics through the Montanist controversy. The suggestion is ingenious, and to ourselves convincing. But it is the first step in an argument which might well cause any reader to distrust the author's critical powers. Having proved satisfactorily that the 'prophet' is described in this extract under a kindred and, so to say, stereotyped phrase, which defines his character but avoids his name, Harnack next assumes that any other difficult expression here must have a similar reference, and so if St. John is described as a priest it is clear Polycrates meant he was a prophet.

The second error is a far more serious and far less excusable one. Harnack does not, indeed, follow the example of Dr. Hatch in the essentially unhistorical and uncritical distinction which that writer makes between the New Testament and the rest of early Christian literature by excluding the former from his survey.<sup>1</sup> But if he does not withdraw from us, like Dr. Hatch, large portions of the evidence, he attains by his arbitrary treatment of documents a not dissimilar result. This is effected in one of three ways. Sometimes the genuineness of a document is denied altogether, as happens with the Acts, the Epistle to the Ephesians, and the Pastoral Epistles. But the case for the Acts is so strong, there are so many lines that converge to one conclusion, that we cannot understand how any man of sense can refuse to go at least as far as Renan and Pfleiderer—surely no hyperorthodox critics. The Epistle to the Ephesians can show external testimony of the most weighty kind; and if the Pastoral Epistles are less decisively authenticated, they are clearly employed by Polycarp, and, whatever be the date of his letter, is it an easy hypothesis that an immediate disciple of the Apostles should have been so misled as to accept forgeries as genuine? The second of Harnack's methods is to juggle the dates even of the authori-

<sup>1</sup> The reason is rather naively hinted at in the preface to Dr. Hatch's second edition. Reading between the lines, it would seem that he did not feel inclined to accept the Acts or Pastoral Epistles, but feared that an open rejection of them, necessary if he treated of the New Testament polity, would militate against the impartial consideration of his theories, since the questions connected with those books, 'in England at least, have not reached the point at which discussion becomes profitable.'

ties he admits. He has been convinced, for instance, of the genuineness of the Ignatian letters, but he attempts to diminish their significance by an alteration of twenty years in their date. We are ready to concede that Ignatius's conception of the ministry is a difficulty when compared with that of his contemporaries; but the early date (110-117 A.D.) is sufficiently substantiated not only by the traditions connecting him with Trajan, but by the impossibility of the use of quasi-Valentinian language—e.g. 'the Word proceeding from Silence' (*Magn. viii.*)—in an anti-Gnostic writer as late as 138 A.D. (the alternative date), and by the improbability that Polycarp, who would then be about seventy—he was born in 69 A.D.—should have been addressed in the tone of affectionate admonition which Ignatius uses towards him, as an older to a much younger bishop. The internal difficulties too are greatly lightened when we take into account, first, the intense personality of Ignatius, and, secondly, his connexion with Antioch, where episcopacy spreading from Jerusalem would mature itself yet sooner than in Asia Minor. Lastly, even when he has accepted a book and has done what he likes with the date, Harnack does not lay fair stress on its evidence if it does not tally with his preconceived ideas. To pursue the same instance, he has fixed the Ignatian Epistles about the same time as he has fixed *Hermas* and a good deal earlier than he has placed the *Teaching*; and yet he has devoted to them not one-twentieth of the space which he has given to the other two, although Ignatius was a trusted and responsible leader in the Christian communities, while the author of the *Shepherd* was obscure and the author of the *Teaching* unknown.

But it is time to supplement the negative processes of criticism by the presentation of a counter-theory, and it will be seen that the difference between Harnack and ourselves will often lie less in the system of development portrayed than in the consequences which follow a variation in date of half a century or even more; significant as those would be in any case they are doubly so when they affect our answer to the question whether the shape finally assumed by the polity of the Christian Church can be traced back or not to the authority of the Apostles themselves. In the space which remains at our disposal we must dispense with many points of high interest, and can do no more than call attention to what seem to us some of the most fundamental phenomena in the history of the Christian ministry between the Day of Pentecost and those later decades of the second century when the principle of the Catholic episcopate was confessedly triumphant

throughout the Church. These let us at the outset sum up under seven heads—the dependence of office on mission; the hierarchical character of the various Church offices from the first; the contrast between the general and the local ministry essentially temporary; the beginnings of Church organization on the latter lines even in the Apostolic times; the merging of the general into the local ministry, in particular of the teachers in the presbyters and the higher offices in the bishops; and in consequence the twofold position of the bishop, first as an original episcopos and then as the successor of Prophets and Apostles.

1. The principle of mission runs through all the New Testament conception of office. It is so even with our Lord Himself; it is so with the Apostles; it is so with all other Christian ministers. 'No man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron. So also Christ glorified not Himself to be made an high priest, but He that said unto Him, Thou art My Son' (Heb. v. 4, 5). 'As Thou hast sent Me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world' (John xvii. 18). 'How shall they preach, except they be sent?' (Rom. x. 15).<sup>1</sup> We showed on a former occasion<sup>2</sup> how this principle was exemplified in the Church by the position of the Apostles; that through them alone originally came the gift of the Holy Ghost, the indispensable charisma of all office, conveyed by the laying on of hands; and that they, or those commissioned by them, ratified in the same way the appointment of even the local officials of each infant community. A final illustration of this universal dependence may be supplied by the relations of the metropolis of the Gentile to the metropolis of the Jewish Church. Not only do the first preachers of the Gospel at Antioch come, as was inevitable, from the Jewish capital, but their success is followed by the definite mission of the prophet Barnabas (ἐξαπέστειλαν), who is followed by 'prophets of Jerusalem' (Acts xi. 19, 22, 27). And though the 'certain men from Judæa' (Acts xv. 1) were perhaps not authorized representatives of the mother Church, the contrary was emphatically the case with the prophets Judas and Silas (Acts xv. 22, 27), who were 'chosen men' of the company at Jerusalem and were formally 'sent' as delegates with authority (ἀπεστέλλκαμεν) to the daughter Church.

2. That these holders of 'office' in the Church constituted

<sup>1</sup> The word for 'to send' in all these cases (ἀποστέλλω, cf. ἀπόστολος) implies delegation of authority. See Westcott on John xx. 21.

<sup>2</sup> *Church Quarterly Review* for January 1887, p. 373.



sum up  
ion; the  
from the  
ministry  
nization  
merging  
r of the  
bishops;  
o, first as  
Prophets

w Testa-  
rd Him-  
all other  
nto him-

So also  
t, but He  
As Thou  
ent them  
y preach,  
a former  
e Church  
m alone  
pensable  
f hands;  
ed in the  
s of each  
ersal de-  
etropolis  
ch. Not  
come, as  
success is  
Barnabas  
rusalem'  
men from  
presenta-  
ically the  
27), who  
and were  
καμην) to

onstituted  
ἀπόστολος)

a hierarchy from the earliest times—in other words, that there existed gradations of rank and ministry, and these confined to certain offices—is, again, a point on which we have already dwelt in connexion with the evidence of the First Epistle to the Corinthians.<sup>1</sup> 'Firstly apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly teachers,' is a text which Harnack also (p. 99, *note*) takes to prove that these three orders, and these only—the clergy, so to speak, of that primitive age—held definite rank in the Church. And the list of the Corinthian Epistle is only the first and most original of a series of similar catalogues of offices in the Church of the first and early second century, which differ indeed according to the stage of development they represent in the actual order and names of the offices denoted, but agree in the principle, on which we are now insisting, of a graduated hierarchy.

3. Those differences, however, can all be reduced to variations of one main phenomenon, the substitution of the local for the general ministry. The distinction between apostles,<sup>2</sup> prophets, and teachers on the one hand and bishops or episcopi, presbyters, and deacons on the other ought now to be familiar to every student of early Church history; the former the only ministry of the very earliest times, the latter holding its ground exclusively in the end. It is the change from the one to the other which is the real problem of primitive Church organization; and yet although the details cannot be called other than obscure, the principle which underlies them, while comparatively overlooked, is comparatively simple. Admittedly the one was the missionary, the other the stationary, organization of the Church; and the alteration in their relative position is at least half explained when we remind ourselves of the contrast between the year 50 A.D. and the year 150 A.D. In A.D. 50 the Christian Church was a society which had taken firm root in a single province of the Roman Empire. Outside Palestine Antioch was probably the only city of importance with a fully organized community. True, the proselytizing activity of individuals was in play already, and had perhaps by this time dotted the Eastern Mediterranean with isolated half-Jewish communities, in more or less close connexion with the Church at home. But St. Paul had only made one missionary journey, and had then only reached a fractional dis-

<sup>1</sup> *Church Quarterly Review*, *ibid.*, p. 374.

<sup>2</sup> When we speak of apostles and prophets, &c., the word 'apostles' must be understood in the wider sense (not limited to the Twelve at all), which, although its extent has been greatly exaggerated by some modern writers, has undoubtedly a basis in fact.

tance into the heart of Asia Minor ; and more important still than the local circumscription of the Church was the fact that till that memorable journey Christianity had directed its preaching to Jews and Hellenists alone. It was only at this moment that the world-wide, all-embracing commission of the Apostles was adequately realized ; and as the full meaning of that stupendous task dawned upon the consciousness of the yet infant Church, need we wonder that then and for a considerable time after, the missionary equipment seemed the one thing needful ? But as city after city was reached and held as an outpost in the name of Christ, as the Gospel penetrated over the whole Eastern and at least the Greek-speaking portions of the Western world, as not only at Jerusalem and Antioch, but at Ephesus and all the countless cities of Asia Minor, at Corinth and the cities of Achaia, in Alexandria and in Rome, in Lyons and the Province, stable communities developed, centres in their turn from which, besides the populace of the towns, the surrounding districts might be Evangelized, no longer as independent but as daughter Churches ; was it not equally inevitable that the organization of the great Churches—themselves the missionaries of their provinces, and even more than that, the safeguards of Catholic unity, the channels of Apostolic tradition, in a word, the representatives of Christianity—should be to the Christians of the middle of the second century the type, and the only type, of the Christian ministry ?

4. So much is clear. But the crucial question still remains : When did the transition begin to take place ? when may it be said to have been accomplished ? Was it foreseen from the first, and was its working presided over by the Apostles themselves ? The evidence is of two kinds—positive traces of the existence and importance of the local ministry, and the negative argument drawn from the gradual cessation and at length the total disappearance of allusions to the Apostles and Prophets ; and both so far coincide that it is not too much to say that they enable us unhesitatingly to attribute the change to Apostolic authority. The Apostles and Prophets meet us in the earliest age as the two supreme orders of the Christian ministry. Together with the Teachers they form the great triad of the First Epistle to the Corinthians. On their foundation alone is the Church, according to the Ephesian Epistle (ii. 20), built, Jesus Christ Himself joined with them as the chief Corner-stone. Yet in no later passage of the primitive literature of the Church (with the exceptions of the Apocalypse and of that document whose date is to be fixed by our present

inquiry) are these two orders mentioned together even as the highest only in a series of gradations. Separate the two, and still the mention of either as a factor in the Christian hierarchy can scarcely be brought down later. The Prophets may, indeed, be traced as underlying the 'prophecies' which accompany ordination in the Pastoral Epistles. The Apostles have been thought to survive still in the *Shepherd* of Hermas. Yet the total absence in that book of the Prophets, except as individuals standing in no authoritative position of supremacy, but rather wholly apart from the enumeration of the ministry, is against any such interpretation, since the prophetic order admittedly survived the apostolic; and while there is nothing to show that the Apostles of Hermas are a still existent body, there is one allusion (*Sim.* ix. 17) which would suggest even a limitation to the Twelve. At any rate beyond this date—after the beginning of the second century<sup>1</sup>—the two orders disappear. Neither is any longer ever spoken of as the living apex of the Christian society. Nay, more: no individual apostle can be named; and such prophets as we do meet with are individuals, not members of an order, and had not as prophets inherited any powers of ruling in the Church. To the great writers of the sub-Apostolic times—to Clement, to Ignatius, to Polycarp, to Justin Martyr, and perhaps also to Hermas—the Apostles were the Twelve. Similarly 'the Prophets' as a body are to the writers of the second century the prophets of the Old Testament. In Theophilus of Antioch they are contrasted with the Gospels; in the Muratorian canon, by Justin Martyr, and by Polycarp, with the Apostles; in Ignatius with the Gospel, with the Apostles, and with the Church. In Hege-sippus, in the Epistle to Diognetus, in Clement, the same is the only use. It is no longer of 'the (Christian) Prophets' but only of possession of the 'prophetic charisma' that we still hear. Justin Martyr knows of such men and women, (*Dial.* 82, 88); yet after the middle of the century the existence even of individuals who were simply prophets is at best a precarious supposition. The polemic of the Church against Montanism seems to have proceeded more or less on the tacit assumption of their extinction; and at any rate the writer of Eus. v. 17, in enumerating a list of Church prophets, records among second-century names (besides certain prophetesses) the name of one prophet only, Quadratus, himself perhaps identical with the Bishop of Athens. The industry even of Eusebius, in a pas-

<sup>1</sup> It would require too much space to exhibit the arguments which combine to make us place Hermas at this date. It must suffice to refer to Dr. Salmon's *Non-Canonical Books* quoted above.

sage so much earlier in his work (iii. 37) that it seems hardly likely to depend on this chapter, has not availed to mention among prophets 'of that time'—the time of the immediate disciples of the Apostles, of Clement and Ignatius—a single other name. Certainly Quadratus must have been a younger contemporary of these Fathers; but it is equally clear that he was anterior to Montanus, who claimed to succeed him in the prophetic gift (Eus. v. 17); and about the same limit of 150 A.D. is therefore supplied us here too as witnessing the cessation of the prophets in the Church. It is true that this very author quoted by Eusebius declares that the prophetic charisma must be permanent 'in the whole Church;' but his argument would imperatively have called for the mention of the individuals preserving the succession, if such he had meant, and his silence here, as well as the special phrase quoted, show that he merges the charisma in the Church.<sup>1</sup>

Harnack produces (p. 123) fourteen references to prove the importance of prophets in the Early Church. Of these six relate to sects and heresies, and two, Barnabas and Hermas, do not take us beyond the first years of the century; two more, Justin and the anti-Montanist writer in Eusebius, we have dealt with; two more only, Celsus and Lucian, are of sufficient interest to claim a word. Well, Celsus stated that he had heard prophets; but, since we do not know when he wrote (Keim's date is 177 A.D.), still less when he heard them (or, lastly, whether the same solution as in Lucian's case may not be the true one), his evidence does not go for much. Let us turn, then, to Lucian. In that author's *Peregrinus*, the hero who gives his name to the story, on falling in with the Christians, 'soon showed what innocents they were, being *προφήτης καὶ θιασάρχης καὶ συναγωγεὺς*, and what not, all in his own person.' Now Harnack admits that by this time Prophets had long ago died out in the Church of Asia Minor; he admits too (cf. his *Dogmengeschichte*) in the fullest degree—in direct opposition to Dr. Hatch<sup>2</sup>—that Montanus and his 'new prophecy' represented innovation rather than reaction; and yet he adduces Lucian's experiences to correct the

<sup>1</sup> In what sense we shall see below.

<sup>2</sup> Hatch, *B. L.* p. 122. We regret to see that Professor Sanday, writing in the *Expositor* of last February, adheres, though of course less unreservedly, to the same exaggerated conception of the high character of the Montanists. We should concede its truth of the Western Montanism which could attract Tertullian, but it seems to us unhistorical to refuse to lay any weight at all on the statements of the Catholic writers of Asia Minor. And in the fourth century, at any rate, it is clear that there was a marked difference between the Montanism of Asia Minor and that of the West.

evidence of the Church writers on the characteristics of the true Prophet. But if there were none in Asia—and there is no evidence of their later survival elsewhere—how should Lucian, who is at least as late as Montanus, know more about it than the Church writers, his contemporaries? Remembering, then, that in other points Lucian has drawn from individual cases in his portraiture of the impostor—witness his employment of the Ignatian letters—we are inclined to turn the tables on Harnack and to see here not a check on the anti-Montanist argument, but a trait drawn from the life of Montanus himself; for who could be more truly described as ‘prophet and thiasarch’<sup>1</sup> than the Phrygian ecstatic? And if we are told ‘they held him for God,’ we cannot see what real parallel Harnack finds in the command of the Teaching, ‘Thou shalt honour thy minister as the Lord;’ but we do see a natural exaggeration of Montanus’ utterance in his trances: ‘I am come not an angel or ambassador, but God the Father.’ Even the rapacity with which Peregrinus preyed on the Christians—‘large supplies came in to him from them by reason of his bonds, and he made this no small source of revenue;’ ‘the Christians were an ample income to him,’ &c.—tallies exactly with the specific charges brought by Apollonius (Eus. *H. E.* v. 18) against the Montanist leaders. Montanus is ‘the fellow who has set up tax-collectors, who manages his receipt of gain under the name of “offerings,” who lavishes salaries on the preachers of his Word.’ ‘Their so-called prophets and martyrs amass gain little by little, not only from the rich, but even from the poor and orphans and widows.’ Indeed, the more passages of both we could quote the greater would seem the resemblance. Pseudo-prophets and pseudo-martyrs are the two characters Apollonius delineates in Montanism, and both coincide strangely in the person of Lucian’s Peregrinus. The evidence of time and place supports the presumptive connexion, for the genuine Peregrinus immolated himself at Olympia in 165 A.D., and Lucian wrote his *Life* soon after, but not before he had revisited Asia Minor. This was not only the locality, but also apparently just the period most favourable to our hypothesis, for Montanus had earned by this time a flourishing reputation, while the definite condemnation which severed him outwardly from the main body of Christians did not perhaps take place till 172 A.D. We venture, therefore,

<sup>1</sup> *συναγωγὴς* is more difficult. We need not, of course, press every word in Lucian’s account as referring to Montanus; but if it does, are we to see a clue to the meaning in Apollonius’ phrase? Montanus called Pepuza and Tymium ‘Jerusalem,’ *τοὺς πανταχόθεν ἐκεῖ συναγαγεῖν ἐθέλων*.

to reiterate our original conclusion, for neither on Lucian's nor on any other evidence was the Church familiar even with individual Prophets (who were prophets only) after the middle of the second century.

But parallel to the gradual process by which the Apostles and the Prophets as living entities sink first into insignificance and then into oblivion is a similar but converse phenomenon. It would not be natural to find that there should be one period when the Church possessed a hierarchy of one set of offices, and a second period when others were in their places, and yet a lengthy interval during which she was not officered at all. And, in fact, even before the first moment at which the original orders begin to recede into the background, long ere the Apostolic age had closed, the importance of the local ministry of bishops and presbyters commences to assert itself, and it was only as these gained prominence year by year and could assume the unfettered leadership of the Christian societies that the elder offices could silently and unnoted die away. In the protracted enumeration of the Corinthian Epistle *Episcopi* and *Presbyters* hold no place at all. But the Epistle to the *Philippians* is addressed to the Church there 'with *Episcopi* and *Deacons*,' and in the series of *Ephesians* iv. 11, so closely parallel in form to the Corinthian list, the local ministry have attained equality, with something even of superiority, in relation at least to the lowest rank of the earlier triad: 'He hath given some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors' and Teachers.' Already long before, the Church of Jerusalem had been governed by St. James and the Presbyters under the eyes of the Apostles themselves. In the *Apocalypse* the Presbyters or Elders are the representatives before the Throne, not only of the old but of the new covenant. St. Peter exhorts the presbyters as 'their fellow-presbyter.' St. John writes simply as 'the Presbyter.' Can there be any longer a doubt that the growing prominence of the local ministry, at least in the organized districts of the Church, under the immediate sanction of the Apostles themselves, is such that it must have been definitely intended by them in the end—as a rule, upon their own decease—to be independent of all external control?

Ample confirmation of this view may be derived from the sub-Apostolic age. *Hermas* at Rome, in his full enumeration of the ministry (*Vis.* iii. 5), writes of 'the Apostles and Bishops

<sup>1</sup> That the 'pastor' or shepherd is equivalent to *episcopus* or *presbyter* is not denied; it is evident, both from the meaning of the word and from passages like *Acts* xx. 28, *1 Peter* v. 2.



and Teachers and Deacons.' The Prophets have disappeared; the Apostles are very probably the Twelve; the Teachers, whom we have already seen in the Ephesians, combined with the Pastors, are now a subordinate rank to the Bishops.<sup>1</sup> Ignatius at Antioch, the Church which of all next to Jerusalem must have soonest stereotyped its organization, knows of no other authority in the Churches but the Bishop, the Bishop with his Presbytery, or the Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. 'Apart from these is not even the name of a Church' (*Trall.* § 3), so completely are the older orders absent from the range of his ideas. But the most significant fact of all is that almost every single great leader of the Church in the second century, every surviving depositary of the Apostolic tradition of the first ages, is definitely linked by the episcopal title to the local ministry in the complete and final stage of its development.

It is true that Dr. Hatch (*B. L.* p. 88, note) traverses this by declaring—

'The earliest use of the word (bishop) with a definite reference to an individual is the inscription of the letter of Ignatius to Polycarp,<sup>2</sup> but the absence of the definite article and the inscription of Polycarp's own letter<sup>3</sup> are inconsistent with the hypothesis that the word was already specially appropriated to the head of the community. The next earliest use of the word is probably also in reference to Polycarp in the letter of Polycrates to Victor, ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 24.'

Now, we are willing to do full justice to the exemplary merits which Dr. Hatch shares with German scholars as a patient accumulator of facts, but, in spite of all the value we can manage to attribute to the constitutions of pagan guilds and the institutions of pagan emperors, we desiderate occasionally in him some measure of acquaintance with the Christian literature not so much of the obscurer as of the primary writers: let us say of the two he has alluded to here, the Epistles of Ignatius and the History of Eusebius. Take the letter of Polycrates quoted from the latter. Dr. Hatch has omitted to state that not only Polycarp, but Thraseas of Eumenia and Sagaris of Laodicea, and by implication Melito of Sardis, are there denominated bishops. Take, at the other end, the Ignatian Epistles. He has again overlooked the fact that Onesimus of Ephesus (*Eph.* i.), Damas of Magnesia (*Magn.* ii.),

<sup>1</sup> Whether the bishops are here bishops in the later sense or not makes no difference to the immediate argument; but see below.

<sup>2</sup> 'Ignatius, who is also Theophorus, to Polycarp, bishop of the Church of the Smyrneans.'

<sup>3</sup> 'Polycarp and the presbyters with him.'

Polybius of Tralles (*Trall.* i.), besides the writer himself (*Rom.* ii.), share the title of bishop with Polycarp.<sup>1</sup> And as for the intermediate half-century and more (for the letter of Polycrates is not earlier than 195 A.D.), during which Dr. Hatch has found no instances at all, a cursory reference to Eusebius would have supplied him with several. The abstract noun 'episcopate' and the verb 'to be bishop' are used with 'definite references to individuals,' and in the sense of monarchical episcopacy by Hegesippus of Primus of Corinth (*Eus.* iv. 23), by the letter of the Gallic Churches of Pothinus of Lyons (*Eus.* v. 1), and by Irenæus of Linus, Clement, and Eleutherus of Rome (v. 6). The actual title of bishop is used by Hegesippus of Symeon of Jerusalem (iv. 23), by the Church of Smyrna of Polycarp (iv. 15), by Dionysius of Corinth of Soter of Rome (iv. 23), by Irenæus of Hyginus of Rome (iv. 11) and of Polycarp (iv. 14), and by the anti-Montanist author (v. 16) of Zoticus of Comana and Julian of Apamea.<sup>2</sup> These are from Eusebius alone, and only from absolute quotations of second-century writers. Does Dr. Hatch need any further witness to second-century belief?

5. We have hitherto shown, first, that the substitution of a local for a missionary supremacy over the Christian communities was necessary in the nature of things, and then that as a matter of fact the development by which the earlier system sank into insignificance and the later rose into prominence was one which was not only practically complete by the year 150 A.D., but can be traced in germ a hundred years before, was in full activity by the end of the first century, and was therefore in principle at least sanctioned by the Apostles themselves. Yet even under Apostolic authority all this would be scarcely likely to have taken place with such rapidity, and still more with such absence of friction, had the process been an absolute reversal of one set of conditions in favour of another and wholly distinct organization, without the intervention of any intermediate stages which should more or less

<sup>1</sup> As for the argument that the article is omitted, it must suffice to say (1) that by parity of reasoning the whole address ought to be translated 'to Polycarp, a bishop of a Church of Smyrneans, to whom rather a God (and) a Father is bishop;' (2) that the article ('the bishop') is used twice in chap. v., once at least in chap. vi.; (3) that it is used of Damas, Polybius, and Ignatius in the references given above; (4) that anyone who can persuade himself that Ignatius, who in eight passages (including *Smyrn.* viii. xii. and *Polyc.* vi.) names together bishop, presbyters or presbytery, and deacons, does not mean the monarchical episcopate, must be past the reach of argument.

<sup>2</sup> The date of this writer, the latest in our list, seems to have been about 193 A.D., just earlier than Polycrates.

conceal the importance of the revolution which was at work. But this it was not. On the contrary, the evidence shows us that on both sides influences were in play contributing to bridge over the gulf of transition. The general ministry tends to localize itself; the local ministry tends to assume some of the characteristics of the general. In a word, the result was rather to merge than to replace.

The tendency to localize in the case of the general ministry shows itself in the most archaic period. The Prophets and Teachers of the Church of Antioch (Acts xiii. 1) seem a fairly settled body. It is only when consecrated to the Apostolate that Paul and Barnabas enter on a directly missionary life; and even afterwards St. Paul 'abode long time' at Antioch, was eighteen months at Corinth, and three years at Ephesus. But if these visits, although lengthy, were after all not permanent, it was a different thing, in the nature of the case, when the Apostles reached old age. So St. Philip is definitely associated with Hierapolis and St. John with Ephesus. Indeed, if the earlier date and Johannine authorship of the *Apocalypse* are admitted, the connexion in the latter case cannot have lasted less than thirty years. And just as on the one hand the earlier system thus abandoned its most patent differentiation, so on the other such of its functions and characteristics as were not part of its missionary commission nor the extraordinary and temporary endowment by supernatural gifts of the infancy of the Church, were not conceived of as lost simply because the orders to which they belonged seemed to have disappeared. Rather, the Apostolic and the Prophetic charisma were still asserted to be part and parcel for all time of the divine equipment of Christianity. 'The Prophetic charisma must exist in the whole Church till the consummated Presence' (writes the anti-Montanist, Eus. v. 17: see above); where by 'the whole' is meant either, as the argument suggests, all times of the Church, or, as is better suited to the words, every one of the communities which make up the Church; in either case not the laity as opposed to the clergy (which would rather be a Montanist view), nor individual prophets (who must have been mentioned) but they who, in the language of the Teaching (*Did.* xv. i.), 'themselves also minister to you the ministry of the Prophets and Teachers,' the permanent local ministry of the 'bishops and deacons.' Similarly when Alexander the Phrygian is said in the 'Letter of the Gallic Churches' (Eus. v. i.) to have been in favour 'by reason of his boldness in the Word, for he was not without a share of Apostolic charisma,' it is not, especially in the light

of the evidence we are coming to, an unreasonable assumption if we believe that this denotes clerical office.<sup>1</sup>

6. For the general convergence which we have sought to establish between the two systems will be sensibly confirmed if we can show the same to be true between their respective parts. Concurrently with the process by which the more circumscribed organization was being forced to the front as residuary legatee of the general sovereignty in the Church, another process, which has been already indirectly brought before our notice, was accomplishing itself in the same sphere—the evolution of the Episcopate. Once more it would be contrary to historical probabilities if the one phenomenon with its parallelisms of time and place should be altogether unconnected with the other. Once more we find in the facts full ratification of the presumption that the rise of one of the presbyteral body into a position of sole authority was simply a part of the great movement under which the two originally separate and contrasted hierarchies were coalescing; the higher merging itself under the names of the lower, and the lower so far transformed by the higher that the principle of individual monarchy which was inherent in the latter became also characteristic of the former. It is true to say that the ministry of bishops and presbyters as a whole supplanted the ministry of Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers: but it is equally representative of the development, that the supreme power of the first system, residing in the Apostles and in the Prophets, creates for its representative a complete episcopacy, while the subordinate function of the Teachers is preserved in the subordinate office of the presbyters. In support of this conception of the episcopate, three lines of argument may be urged; the first illustrating the intermediate links between

<sup>1</sup> Either the term was itself technical enough to signify this, as is very possible; or it is an intentional periphrasis (cf. Polycrates above), in which case we might compare the more or less companion letter of the martyrs themselves to Eleutherus (Eus. v. 4), where Irenæus is named at first 'brother and fellow' and not presbyter, because as they explain, Church rank does not necessarily make a man righteous. It is impossible not to see there an indication of the same sort of spirit which in its maturity produced the conflict of the Carthaginian martyrs with Cyprian. If, indeed, Alexander was not really a priest at all, we must see here the other aspect of the temper which treated Irenæus as a layman—priestly functions, as it were, attributed to a martyr. Harnack entirely exaggerates when he puts Martyrs and Confessors at the head of a series of charismata of their own, as a sort of rival organization to the regular offices of the Church (p. 149); but no doubt we do find represented in them sometimes the same sort of opposition to ecclesiastical order as in the Montanists. If the Acts of Perpetua are not Montanist, they at least serve to show how much in common there was between the two.

the Apostolate and the episcopate; the second, the actual attribution of apostolic or prophetic<sup>1</sup> position to the bishops; the third, the same in respect of the teaching position of the presbyters. This last, as the furthest removed from our ultimate aim, and yet the clearest in itself, may be disposed of first. It does not, indeed, directly concern us; but it is a valid conclusion that if the presbyters represent Teachers, the bishops probably take the place of Prophets or Apostles.

There are of course a host of passages where so common a word as 'teacher' is used in a wholly general sense, just as we might use it ourselves. But wherever the use is technical or official, then with a wonderful regularity we find it connected with the presbyters; indeed, on no other supposition could we explain its third-century survival, long after the cessation of the mention of the two other orders, than by its natural resemblance to, and early identification with, a permanent office such as the presbyterate. The bishop might hold the position of Apostle and Prophet, but their office clearly only in a limited sense: there was no similar reason on the surface of things why the Teacher and presbyter should not absolutely combine. So the Teachers still meet us in Dionysius and Origen at Alexandria, in Cyprian and the Acts of Perpetua from Africa, and in Hippolytus of Rome: in every case in company with the presbyters. 'The presbyters and teachers,'<sup>2</sup> say Dionysius and Hippolytus. In the Latin of Origen it is 'priests and teachers,' or again 'the high degree of the priesthood or chair of the teacher.' In the African idiom of

<sup>1</sup> One word ought to be said here about the close cohesion of these two orders (so that they seem almost like two sides of the same, and if the bishops succeed to the one, then naturally also to the other); for instance, in the Teaching an Apostle who stays more than three days is a 'false Prophet'; and in Clement of Alexandria, Barnabas is sometimes an Apostle, sometimes a Prophet.

<sup>2</sup> The force of the single Greek article, serving to combine the two classes under one head, must not be overlooked. With it, the two nouns may indeed connote a difference of origin and history but not of present office; and it is used in each instance, in Dionysius, in Hippolytus, and in the Epistle to the Ephesians. Dr. Hatch, whom we have found laying great stress on the absence of the article where it meant nothing, has here overlooked its presence when it means a great deal, quoting these three passages (p. 78, note) to prove the distinction of the offices. How more simply could the connexion have been expressed? The omission of the conjunction, the Latin way out of the difficulty, would be intolerably harsh in Greek. Origen's Latin has 'sacerdotes et doctores,' where no doubt the Greek had the one article, and 'sacerdotii gradum vel cathedram doctoris,' where the use of *vel* shows that the two are not mutually exclusive. (The references are Dionys. ap. Eus. *H. E.* vii. 24; Orig. *Hom. in Num.* ii., *Hom. in Levit.* vi.; Cypr. *Ep.* xxix.; *Acta Perpetua*, xiii.; Hippol. ap. Epiphani. *Hær.* xlii.)

Cyprian and the Acts of martyrdom, it is 'the presbyter-teachers.' Pass from the third century back to the first and we still find the same. In the Epistle to the Ephesians (iv. 11), 'the pastors and teachers' are already one order; in the first Epistle to Timothy (v. 17), 'they who toil in Word and Teaching' are at least the most prominent class among the presbyters. And when Hermas writes, 'the Apostles and Bishops and Teachers and Deacons' (*Vis.* iii. 5), we have the choice of interpreting 'bishops' in its earlier sense as equivalent to presbyters, and then the case is parallel to those just quoted; or, as we almost prefer, of taking 'bishops' strictly, when Teachers will be simply the substitute for the presbyters of the Ignatian series of bishops, presbyters, and deacons.

That the bishops similarly were so far successors of Apostles and Prophets as to have inherited the supreme control of the Churches which formerly vested in those two orders, is undeniable, and is the only reasonable explanation of the origin of the episcopal office, once granted that that was developing itself in the lifetime of the last Apostles. That the bishops were also the special depositaries of apostolic tradition is implied in the stress laid by the second-century writers on the 'apostolic' sees, and the care taken to trace back the lines of succession definitely to their apostolic origin. It is a commonplace with Irenæus and his contemporaries; but earlier still exactly the same principle is represented in Hegesippus (*Eus.* iv. 22), who made such a list at Rome, and also, as it seems, in other places, since he speaks of orthodoxy 'in each "succession" and in each city.' But that the bishops were really even more than this, and in some sense the inheritors and successors of the special offices of the Apostle and Prophet, is a conclusion forcibly suggested by the relation which we have seen existing between the presbyters and Teachers, and is supported by not a little actual evidence. The series of Hermas is again instructive. As the three last members of it—the Bishops, Teachers, and Deacons—are the later triad, except for the retention of the Teachers in place of the presbyters, so the first three—the Apostles, Bishops, and Teachers—are the earlier triad, except that the Bishops occupy the position of the Prophets. In Ignatius, indeed, the prominent thought is a different one, being theological rather than historical, and the Bishop holds the place of Christ, or more often of the Father; but it is strange to think that anyone should have found in this exaltation of the episcopate an argument to show that it was not conceived of as succeeding to the apostolate. Certainly that idea is overbalanced by the higher



one; yet it emerges even in Ignatius. If the bishops are to Christ as Christ to the Father (Ign. *Eph.* iii.), we remember that Christ so expressed His relation with the Apostles (John xvii. 18). If 'the messenger of the Master is to be received as Himself, and the bishop therefore to be looked on as the Lord' (Ign. *Eph.* vi.), the language is again that of the Gospels, as repeated even in later times—'Peter and the rest of the Apostles we receive as Christ' (Serapion, ap. Eus. *H. E.* vi. 12). So also in individual cases. Quadratus, the only recorded later Prophet, was perhaps also a Bishop. More usually it is a Bishop who is also known as a Prophet. Melito, bishop of Sardis, was (Jerome witnesses to Tertullian's statement) 'generally held a Prophet.' Polycarp is, in Irenæus, 'the Apostolic elder' (Eus. v. 20); in the letter of the Smyrneans (xvi.), 'the Apostolic and Prophetic Teacher.' Even Ignatius Theophorus may well mean Ignatius the Inspired.<sup>1</sup>

If any doubts remained as to the intimate coherence of the episcopate with the higher offices which preceded it, they would be removed by considering how many piers history reveals us by the help of which to span the chasm. Two points are worth notice. The 'Evangelists' do not occur in the Corinthian list; but in the Ephesians they are placed between the Apostles and the Prophets on one side, and the Pastors and Teachers on the other. In Eusebius (iii. 37) they, or they and the Pastors, are named as the first successors of the Apostles. Philip the Deacon meets us later on as Philip the Evangelist. Timothy is bidden to 'do the work of an Evangelist' (2 Tim. iv. 4) at the same moment as the Apostle is predicting his own immediate death. Their office, in fact, stands midway between the functions of an Apostle and of a Bishop, just as again, to take the second point, in St. Clement's Epistle we meet with a class unnamed, who intervene between the Apostles and the local ministry of episcopi or presbyters (1 Clem. xlv.), who are ἐλλόγιμοι ἄνδρες, 'men of repute,' who after the Apostles' death, in their place and with their power, appoint (subject to the consent of the Church) to the presbyterial office, just as Timothy, too, received a permanent commis-

<sup>1</sup> Bishop Lightfoot, who rejects the passive interpretation of the name, does not seem to lay enough stress on phrases like Clement's of St. John (Eus. vi. 14), πνεύματι θεοφορηθεῖς. May not (the Syriac translator of) Severus, although he seems to take the active sense, have got hold of some tradition when he says that Ignatius was 'appropriately named from facts, because he foreknew things future' (Lightf. *Ign.* i. 24. 177)? Just the same is said of Polycarp as a Prophet (*l. c.*). See also *Trall.* v.

sion to entrust 'the good deposit' to 'faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also' (2 Tim. i. 14, ii. 2).

The transition to the matured episcopate is easy.

7. What, then, to ask the final question of ever-present interest, are the lawful powers and position of the Bishop in the Christian Church? History connects him, as we have seen, with two lines of ancestry, with the presbyteral office of the primitive episcopos, and with the apostolic and prophetic office, which combined with the other to realize the Bishop. Just as when the clouds descend to the waters, and the waters rise to the clouds, till we know not where the one begins or the other ends, we cannot call the waterspout rain only, or only sea, so the monarchical bishop of seventeen centuries and more of Christianity is the legitimate descendant alike of the greatest among the Apostles and of the humblest president of a village congregation in Palestine. As far as he is an episcopos—for all that his name tells us—he is no more than the presbyter he once was simply, and the continuity of office was never more frankly recognized than by the early Church. Not only in the Acts and Pastoral Epistles, when St. Paul calls together the presbyters of Ephesus and speaks to them of the flock over which the Holy Ghost had set them bishops (Acts xx. 17, 28), or when he reminds Titus that his mission was to appoint presbyters in every city, 'if any be blameless . . . for a bishop must be blameless as the steward of God' (Tit. i. 5, 7); or again, when St. Clement says, 'it will be no slight sin in us if we cast men out of the episcopate: blessed are the presbyters who have gone before' (xliv. 4, 5); but long after the definitive separation of the orders the two terms are in certain cases used interchangeably. Ignatius does not directly call the bishop a presbyter, but he assumes that his office is that of a pastor: 'The Church in Syria hath God for its pastor in my stead; Jesus Christ alone shall be its bishop' (*Rom.* ix.); and the pastor is the equivalent of the presbyter to St. Peter: 'The presbyters among you I exhort . . . be pastors to the flock of God among you' (1 Pet. v. 1, 2), as he is of the original episcopos to St. Paul: 'Bishops, to be pastors of the Church of God' (Acts xx. 28, *ut sup.*). In the next great defender of episcopacy, St. Irenæus, at the end of the century, the identification is direct. Polycarp is said by him to have been appointed by Apostles bishop in the Church in Smyrna (*Iren. ap. Eus. iv. 14*), and yet he is also 'the blessed and apostolic presbyter' (*Iren. ap. Eus. v. 20*). Of the bishops of Rome he mentions Linus, Clement and Eleutherus as succeeding to the episcopate (*Eus. v. 6*), and elsewhere Anicetus

1 P  
it seem  
transla

and Pius, Hyginus and Telesphorus and Xystus as 'the presbyters that were before Soter' (Eus. v. 24). So, too, Clement of Alexandria, in the story of St. John and the Robber, speaks first of the bishop, then of the presbyter, to whose charge the young man was committed. Even after the middle of the third century Firmilian of Cæsarea, referring to the annual Episcopal Synods of Asia Minor, speaks of their constituent members, according to St. Cyprian's translation, as 'seniores et præpositi' (Cypr. *Ep.* lxxv. 4), where the former word doubtless represents *πρεσβύτεροι* of the original.<sup>1</sup> But although the bishop has on one side the same powers only as any presbyter, he is also more than this, endowed with special functions which differentiate him as the representative of the highest offices of the Church, the living embodiment of the original supremacy of the Apostle and the Prophet.

Such was, we believe, in its outline the history of the development of the Christian ministry. Returning now to our starting-point and applying the results of our inquiry to the determination of the date of the 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles,' let us ask first what are the latest parallels to be found elsewhere for its special phenomena, and then what are the earliest divergent representations on points of cardinal importance, which would compel us to mount higher year by year and decade by decade. Working upwards from the lowest grade, the episcopos in the Teaching is still on a level with the presbyter, and the local ministry consists of two orders only; to this the latest parallel is the Epistle of St. Clement. The Prophets as a body are the most prominent order; the Apostles and Prophets together the supreme governors of the Church, raised above the criticism or control of the community; the Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, a universal hierarchy altogether distinct from the circumscribed authority of the bishops and deacons. But the body of Prophets meet us nowhere after the end of the first century; the Apostles and Prophets are never connected later than in the Apocalypse; the three orders of the general ministry are distinctly enumerated only in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Again, in the Teaching the Apostles are still missionary in the very strictest acceptation of the term; but in the closing decade of the first century some of them were permanently settled; in the Teaching the Prophets are only beginning to fix themselves in individual communities, a stage nearly resembling

<sup>1</sup> If 'maiores natu' is used also in the same letter (*ib.* 37), and also as it seems exclusively of Bishops, we feel little doubt that it is only a variant translation of the same word in the original.

that depicted in the later sections of the Acts. Yet more decisive is the second criterion. The Teaching ought to be earlier than Ignatius, who knows exclusively of Bishop, presbyters, and deacons. It ought to be earlier than Hermas, who knows, indeed, of Apostles and Teachers, but of both probably in a different sense, and of 'the Prophets' as an order no longer at all. It ought to be earlier than Clement, to whom the Apostles are the Twelve alone, and their commissioned representatives the only intermediate stage between themselves and the presbyterate. With all the apostolic writings it has something in common; yet even here its standpoint is earlier than in some of them. In the Pastoral Epistles the Teachers seem wholly merged in the presbyters; in the Ephesians the Pastors form one order with the Teachers; in the work before us they are not only separate, but belong to separate systems only just beginning to converge. It is only when we reach the Epistle to the Corinthians, the first fixed stage in the whole course of our inquiry, that we can feel that we have reached, and more than reached, our limit; for there only, outside the Teaching, are the three primal orders of the general ministry visible in their distinctness; and there the local ministry is not classified at all. The Teaching, then, represents a stage of organization intermediate between the Corinthian and Ephesian letters: parallel, let us say roughly, to the Epistle to the Philippians with its earliest mention of *episcopi* and deacons. It follows from this, that, if the Teaching is to be a factor in the series of the full current of Church development, it must be placed about the year 60 A.D.; it does not follow that so early a date is inevitable, if the Teaching represents—and we have seen that it does represent—a line of thought of a quite unique and comparatively alien cast. We have seen, too, that its locality was probably Syria or Palestine; and on the assumption that it emanates from some remote half-isolated district, perhaps beyond the Jordan, tenaciously attached to its traditions, but unaffected by the throbbing pulses of the Church's larger life, a further period of half a generation may be allowed to elapse before an equal stage of maturity is reached. But a date at A.D. 80 is as late as we are prepared to admit.

Our conclusions, both general and particular, have emerged in a very widely different form from Professor Harnack's; a result due, in part, to the widely different theological propensities with which he approached his task, for while conceding to 'Catholicismus' the latter half of the second century, he

is eager to vindicate for 'Protestantismus' the more primitive age; and the references to the 'Preaching of the Word,' by which he seeks to prove his point, are unnecessarily numerous, and often not very germane to the argument. But putting aside questions of mission and ordination, in regard to which it would be unreasonable to anticipate an agreement with us on his part, we might reduce the main issue to the totally divergent estimation not so much of the sequence as of the rapidity of the processes which go to make up the history of the completed polity of the Church. Such a variation, however, is so all-important in a case like this, where everything depends on the date attributed, that there is, it may be, not a single generalization we have made (except only the formation of Catholic episcopacy out of the local episcopos by transference to it of the prerogatives of the general ministry), with which Harnack would coincide; but we have none the less to thank him for the instructive character of his brilliant and suggestive essay. More than all he has helped us, as we believe, however unintentionally, to base more strongly, to explain more reasonably, to develop more naturally the traditional belief of the Christian Church in the authority of the Ministry and the validity of its claim. The 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' was ushered into the arena of criticism with a chorus of rationalist and latitudinarian applause; but thoughtfully considered, and interpreted by other evidence, as well as interpreting it in its turn, it is found just to add to our evidence where its scantiness was greatest, just to supply the vacant link in the chain which rivets together indissolubly the ecclesiastical polity of to-day with the Apostolic organization and Divine foundation of the Church of Christ.

---

emerged  
Harnack's; a  
al propen-  
conceding  
century, he

## ART. VI.—THE LANGUAGE SPOKEN BY CHRIST AND THE APOSTLES.

1. *De Sibyllinis Oraculis*. Auctore ISAAC VOSSIO. (Oxonizæ, 1722.)
2. *Horæ Syriacæ*. Auctore NICOLAO WISEMAN. (Romæ, 1828.)
3. *Of the Language of Palestine in the Age of Christ and the Apostles*. By DE ROSSI and H. F. PFANNKUCHE. Translated in the *Biblical Cabinet* by T. G. REPP. (Edinburgh, 1833.)
4. *An Apology for the Septuagint*. By E. W. GRINFIELD. (London, 1850.)
5. *Discussions on the Gospels*. By A. ROBERTS. (Cambridge, 1864.)
6. *The Hebrew New Testament*. By FRANZ DELITZSCH. (Leipzig, 1883.)
7. *Of the Dialects Spoken in Palestine in the Time of Christ*. By AD. NEUBAUER, M.A. [*Studia Biblica*.] (Oxford, 1885.)

WHAT was the language commonly employed by Christ and His Apostles in their public ministrations is a *quæstio vexata* which there does not seem much probability in determining from the materials now existing and available. The late Cardinal Wiseman in an excursus 'De Lingua Christi et Apostolorum,' in his *Horæ Syriacæ*, gave it as his opinion that the controversy could not be decided except by mutual concessions on the part of the disputants, which would amount to shelving the question without coming to any conclusion. That three languages were known and probably spoken in Palestine at the Christian era is evident from the inscription on the cross. The comparative prevalence of each among the people has been unwarrantably inferred from the order of the terms employed by S. Luke—Greek, Latin, and Hebrew—but from this no argument can be drawn, because S. John gives it as Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. The first must mean the Aramaic vernacular then spoken by the masses of the Jewish people, and the second the current Greek language, which may have been known to and been spoken by a section of the upper classes, and the third the ordinary Roman, probably spoken by the Governor and the government officials and used in the courts of law and in legal documents. Professor



Neubauer takes this inscription as affording conclusive proof that there were great numbers of Jews who did not know Greek, but before his time Wiseman, Roberts and others maintained that Pilate, at the trial of Jesus, carried on his conversation with the priests, rulers, and the populace in that language. Further evidence that Greek was known in Palestine in the time of Christ has been derived from plates which Josephus said were affixed to the wall enclosing the Court of the Priests and Israelites in the Temple of Herod, with an inscription in that language warning Gentiles from going beyond the court appropriated to them on pain of death. The accuracy of the historian has been verified by the discovery, in 1871, by the officers of the Palestine Exploration Fund in the *débris* of the Temple of one of them, containing the inscription as he described it.

It may be said without hesitation that the Aramaic mixed with Hebrew terms was the vernacular of the people of Palestine in the time of Christ, but beyond this there is the further question whether there was not also spoken along with it, modernized Hebrew, as distinguished from Biblical, retained by the Jews after their return from the Babylonish captivity, and still represented in the Mishna, in the Hebrew portions of the Talmud, and in the Midrashim. Professor Franz Delitzsch held that after the exile Hebrew still continued to be the language of Jewish literature; that Ecclesiasticus was written in it, the First Book of Maccabees, and the so-called Psalter of Solomon. It was also used for inscriptions on coins, epitaphs, liturgical prayers, benedictions, and traditional law. According to him it was the language in which the Saviour spoke to S. Paul on the road to Damascus, and in which the latter addressed the Jerusalem populace (Acts xxii.). The *Ἑβραῖς διάλεκτος* was the language of the Temple and synagogue worship, but the lessons from the law and the prophets were read and the blessings were always given in Biblical Hebrew, the former being as generally known among the educated Jews of that age as it is among the better classes of the nation at the present day. When Josephus, in the preface to his *Jewish War*, said that the narrative was originally drawn up for the information of his compatriots living in Central Asia in 'the common mother tongue,' Delitzsch thought that he meant by this expression modernized Hebrew and not Aramaic. The latter is called in the Talmud סורסי. It was spoken by the nation generally, was the language of daily life, and the dialect in which the people and the learned held their controversies. The Palestinian Sursi was, however, not so generally under-

stood or spoken by Jews who had emigrated to other countries, who from the necessities of their situation, and from the tendencies of the times, were probably better acquainted with the prevailing Greek language, but Neubauer and Pfannkuche suppose that they were generally able to some extent to speak the native Hebrew dialect, because on the occasions of their visits to the Temple at the great festivals there is no mention of their needing interpreters either inside or outside the sacred building.

With these views Neubauer generally agrees, but he differs from them on points of some importance. He does not admit that the Jews during the captivity had forgotten the *Jehudith* language (Isaiah xxxvi. 11), or exchanged it for the Babylonian Aramaic, because, during the exile, several of the prophets and Ezra and Nehemiah addressed themselves to the Jews in pure Hebrew, from which it seems pretty certain that most of those who returned spoke the Hebrew language, although possibly intermixed with Aramaic terms. In addition to those already referred to, there are other traces of the modernized Hebrew in the interval between the return and the Christian era. Neubauer fixes the date of the earliest parts of the Mishna in the beginning of the second century before Christ, and assigns to this period the tractates *Yoma* and *Aboth*, which were, according to him, written in modernized Hebrew, showing in the latter, as the *Pirqé* proceed in the order of succession, a gradual increase of new terms. The *Mekilta*, the *Pesiqta* (sections) of the *Haphtaroth*, and the *Sifré*, all of which are of great antiquity, were composed in the same language. The discussions between the Pharisees and the Sadducees, which seem to be recorded *verbatim* in the Mishna; popular songs in the Temple at the Feast of Tabernacles, alluded to in John vii. 37; the hymn sung by the young women in the vineyards on the evening of the Day of Atonement; the examination of witnesses by the Sanhedrim, for determining the time of the appearance of the new moon; the *Thosifta* and the *Sifra*, were also written in the same dialect. Along with this, the Aramaic language sprang up and gradually developed itself, until it became the vernacular of the common people. During the rule of the Seleucidæ it was the official language of Asia, so that many Jews found it expedient to make themselves acquainted with it, many technical terms being borrowed from it, in the same way as the Romans afterwards borrowed Greek words. The Mishna mentions vessels used in the Temple which had both Aramaic and Greek inscriptions. Immigrants from Babylon

and the northern parts of Palestine, where Aramaic was spoken, may have contributed to the spread of the language in Jerusalem, where at the Christian era a purer dialect of it seems to have been spoken than in Galilee (Mark xiv. 70). About this time the Targums came into more general use, and Aramaic began to be employed in liturgical *formule*, as in the *Qaddish*, and in the first instance in the introduction to the *Haggadah*, or the history of the Exodus from Egypt, recited on the evening of the Passover. The beginning of these innovations may be fixed in the first century before Christ. In this period the Aramaic of the north was the popular language, being called the dialect of the common people, as distinguished from the holy language. In the New Testament it is called Ἑβραϊστί (John v. 2) and Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ (Acts xxi. 40, and xxii. 2); and examples of it are found in Matt. xxvii. 46 (λαμῶ), in Mark iii. 17 (Βοανεργές), in Mark vii. 34 (ἐφφαθά), and in other places. Neubauer thinks that the term *Mapavabá*, which passed to the Greek-speaking populations of Asia Minor, was a sufficient proof that the speech of the first Christians was Aramaic, and that the use by the Saviour (Matt. v. 22) of the terms *raca* and *moré* proves that He spoke the Sermon on the Mount in the popular dialect, although this has been denied, as will appear hereafter. It is therefore clear that in the time of Christ there were practically two native languages in use among the Jews—non-biblical Hebrew employed along with pure Hebrew in all religious functions, and known by the educated classes, and Aramaic, of which latter there were several dialects, traces of each being found in the New Testament, commonly spoken by the masses of the common people.

The New Testament shows that there were four of these dialects. The Jerusalem, according to the Talmudists, was most correct, as might naturally be supposed, because it was the capital city and the centre of the religious observances of the nation. Pfannkuche thought that in Acts i. 19 mention is made of a tongue quite different from Greek and Latin, as being the language of the capital, and therefore of the surrounding country. No name is given to it in the text, but the term *Aceldama*, which is Babylonian Aramaic, shows that this is the dialect intended. The Galilean (Matt. xxvi. 73) was more polished and better suited to the rustic character of the people who inhabited that part of the country. With this the Samaritan dialect mainly agreed in its principal features. The Phœnician Aramaic was spoken by the people who lived on the coast of the Mediterranean, who mingled with it

Hellenisms and Latinisms, arising from their intercourse for trading purposes with Greeks and Romans. Pfannkuche's proof of the existence of this dialect is derived from the history of the Syro-Phœnician woman in Mark vii., who followed Jesus to induce Him to heal her daughter. From this case different conclusions have been drawn by Grinfield and Roberts as to the language commonly spoken in Palestine at that time. The former maintained that it was incredible that she could have uttered her cries and lamentations in Greek. He supposed that she spoke the native language of her country, which was Syro-Phœnician or Syro-Chaldaic, then prevalent throughout Judea, Samaria, and Galilee. Subsequently he seems to contradict himself on this matter, because he said that as the knowledge of the ancient Scripture had been widely spread by means of the Septuagint among the Jews, although the woman could not have spoken in Greek to Jesus when she addressed him as the Son of David, she must have derived her knowledge of the term from this version; but it is just as probable that she may have derived it from the Jews, with whom she must have previously associated. On the other hand, Roberts held that she must have spoken Greek, because she is called by St. Mark Ἑλληνίς, which, however, obviously means Gentile, because St. Matthew says that she was a woman of Canaan. He supported this assertion by referring to a decree of Julius Cæsar affecting the cities of Tyre, Sidon, and Askelon, which was ordered to be published in each of them in the Greek and Latin languages. But his authority proves too much, because, as Askelon was a Jewish city, it would show that none of the natives understood Aramaic, and that in the other two both Greek and Latin were spoken by the inhabitants. These four dialects represented as many different aspects of the Palestinian Aramaic, which was then the vernacular of the Jews and not the Greek language.

Further proof that such was the case is furnished by the Aramaic names of persons, objects, and places mentioned in the New Testament. The names compounded of *Bar*, as *Bar-Tolmai* (Bartholomew), *Bar-Abba* (Barabbas), *Bar-Jeshu* (Barjesus), *Bar-Timai* (Bartimæus), and many more, sufficiently indicate their origin. That Aramaic was the language in common use is also proved by the many terms in Greek forms scattered throughout the New Testament dialect, such as Pharisee, Mammon, Beelzebub, Passover, executioner (Mark vi. 27), napkin (Luke xix. 20), Korban, Rabboni, strong drink (Luke i. 15), colony, paper (2 John 12), and others, of which

some have been retained in their original form, while some have been translated into the English vernacular. The same must be said of many geographical names, as Bethesda, Gabbatha, Aceldama, and other terms, the use of which affords conclusive proof that Aramaic was then the popular language.

The conquests of Alexander the Great, irrespective of its inherent beauty and adaptability to express the most subtle forms of human thought, prepared the way for the spread of the Greek language among the peoples whom he subdued by his arms. About this remarkable fact there is no question, because, alike in Asia and subsequently throughout the whole of the Roman Empire, the language, manners, and customs of the Greeks gradually asserted themselves to such an extent that they came to be regarded as proofs of the highest civilization. Greek was known and spoken by almost every educated Roman; and it became the vernacular of those Jewish immigrants who settled in Alexandria, Seleucia, and other towns founded by Alexander the Great and his successors, where there were Greek-speaking populations. In Palestine there was no such necessity or tendency, while, owing to the exclusiveness of the native Jews, and their contempt for the language and usages of other nations, it can scarcely be thought credible that they were influenced to any serious extent by the desire prevailing elsewhere to adopt foreign manners and dialects. During the period of the first Temple there is no trace of any intercourse between Jews and Ionians, and it was not till the times subsequent to the age of Alexander, that the former were brought into contact with foreign usages. That Greek afterwards became universally known and spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ, is an untenable position which some scholars have endeavoured to maintain, although admitting that along with it the vernacular Aramaic was in common use. The truth seems rather to be that the Greek spoken in Asia Minor was only a sort of jargon which the Jews acquired to enable them to carry on business transactions with their neighbours, like the modern Judæo-Spanish. Alexander never attempted to compel them to adopt the Greek language, nor would their contempt for paganism in all its forms have allowed them to fall in with such designs of the conqueror, even if he had entertained them. That the lower classes of Jews in the time of Christ generally understood Greek is at least doubtful. Neither do the remains of Hebrew-Greek literature contribute to establish the position. Neubauer affirms that, as far as is known, no apocryphal book was composed in Greek by a Palestinian

Jew. The Septuagint was not known in Palestine, except to a few learned Jews, and to those who from other countries came to Jerusalem from time to time to attend the great festivals. So ill-disposed were the Jews to this version, that it was said in the Talmud that when it appeared, darkness came over the earth, and that the day was as unfortunate as that on which the golden calf was made, necessitating the appointment of an annual fast. After all the arguments have been exhausted which have been used on the one hand to prove that the Jews were universally acquainted with Greek, and on the other, that only a few of them had a limited knowledge of the language at the Christian era, the fact remains that not a single fragment of any inspired book written by Christian Jews now exists except in the Greek language.

A third opinion is that neither Hebrew nor Greek, but Latin, was the language spoken in Palestine in the time of Christ, and that in it most of the books of the New Testament were originally composed, some being written in Greek, and the Apocalypse at first in Hebrew. It may have been used by a few Roman officials, but to suppose that it was never heard anywhere except when spoken by them, and in courts of law, is not supported by any evidence, while the inscription on the cross shows at least that there were some people in Jerusalem who understood it. The opinion was adopted by Hardouin, and a few other Roman Catholic writers, apparently with the object of exalting the Vulgate, which has been pronounced by the Church of Rome to be authentic, as if it contained the very words spoken and written by the Saviour and His Apostles, but it has never found general acceptance.

That the three languages were known and spoken with different degrees of prevalence in Palestine at the Christian era is an undoubted fact, but scholars are not agreed as to which of them was in common use. That Aramaic was exclusively employed at this period, and therefore the language of Christ and His Apostles, was maintained by Du Pin, Mill, Marsh, Kuinöel, Olshausen, De Rossi, and Pfannkuche. On the other hand, Cappel, Basnage, Lardner, Vossius, Maltby, and Diodati insisted that Greek alone was then used in the Holy Land. Between those extreme opinions there was a middle theory, which supposed that both Greek and Aramaic were in common use—the latter probably as the vernacular in society and among native Jews in general, and Greek on public occasions and for official purposes. It was adopted by Simon, Ernesti, Hug, Wiseman, Credner, and Bleek. The latest and



most thorough-going advocate of it was Dr. Roberts in the part of his work entitled *Discussions on the Gospels* devoted to the examination of 'the language employed by our Lord and His Apostles.' While admitting the concurrent existence of the two languages, he practically held that Christ and the Apostles always spoke Greek in public, and laboured, not always successfully, by elaborate reasoning to maintain his position.

Neubauer has furnished a summary of the opinions on this question of some of these writers, who in some cases only gave them as *obiter dicta*, without entering into elaborate discussions. Vossius was the first to say that it was absurd to suppose that the Jews after the conquest of Alexander the Great had, unlike other nations, preserved their own language instead of adopting that of the conquerors; from which he inferred that Greek was spoken in Palestine from the date of the Macedonian conquest. The argument is weak, because, whatever may have been the tendency of later ages to adopt Greek manners and customs, neither Alexander nor his successors ever attempted to force the Greek language upon the Jews, and even if the attempt had been made, it would have been neutralized by the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes, and finally stopped by the victory gained over him by Judas Maccabeus. Very little progress could have been made in this direction under the rule of the Hasmonean princes, whose interest and policy it was to separate their people as far as possible from the influence of the surrounding nations. After this time the rule of Herod was too brief to allow of much progress being made in the spread of Greek among the people before the Christian era. Diodati, adopting the theory of Vossius, attempted to show that the Jewish vernacular in the time of Jesus was Greek, but known as the Hellenistic language. He was refuted by De Rossi, who endeavoured to prove that the language then spoken was Syro-Chaldee, and that the Hellenistic tongue was not at that time in use. Pfannkuche accepted his conclusions, and reproduced them with notes in a tractate, which was translated into English by Repp and published in the *Biblical Cabinet*. When the impossibility of believing that Greek was the only language spoken in Palestine came to be fully understood, although it may have been in exclusive use at the Court of the Macedonian kings, a middle theory was proposed by Professor Paulus of Jena, who thought that while the common language of the Jews at the Christian era was Aramaic, Greek was so well known in Palestine, and especially in Galilee and

Jerusalem, that Jesus and the Apostles had no difficulty in using it whenever they deemed it expedient. The arguments of Paulus were refuted by Silvestre de Sacy. The dissertations of Paulus and Hug on the Greek language in Palestine were adopted by Roberts, who constructed out of them and from other sources the volume already referred to. His definite opinion that Christ spoke for the most part in Greek, and only occasionally in Aramaic, agrees with that of Paulus. More recent writers, as Renan, Böhl, and Franz Delitzsch generally maintain that the language of the Jews at the Christian era was Syro-Chaldee or Eastern Aramaic.

The absence of all notice of any language spoken by Christ except the vernacular Aramaic, of which a few examples have been preserved in the Gospels, is significant, because if He had used Greek in His public addresses, or in His private communications with His friends, it is difficult to believe that they would not have contained some allusion to the circumstance. Although it may be difficult to explain the reasons which induced two of the Evangelists to preserve with variations the actual words used by the Saviour on particular occasions, they seem to prove that, except in the case of the crucifixion, the conversations were in that language, because it is inconceivable that in such cases they changed from Aramaic to Greek, and *vice versa*. Roberts admits that an explanation is necessary, whether it be supposed that Jesus usually spoke the former, and only occasionally the latter (of which in the case of Greek there is no direct proof whatever), or that He commonly used the latter, and only rarely Aramaic, although it is admitted to have been the language of the country. Whatever the explanation may be, he held that on the former theory it is much easier to account for the peculiarity than on the latter. If Jesus almost always spoke Aramaic, he thought it singular that so few of His sayings in that language should have been preserved, and that no hint should have been given that the Evangelists were specially reporting His actual words. If, on the other hand, Greek was the language commonly used, and if the discourses are reported *verbatim* by the Evangelists, which the differences between them when recording the same discourses show was not the case, it is not surprising that an Aramaic word or phrase should occasionally occur, even though the reason for its use by the Saviour, and for its being particularly noticed by them, may not be apparent. In fact, the difficulty is as great on one theory as on the other.

The theory of Roberts that Christ always spoke Greek in

His public addresses, and specially when delivering the Sermon on the Mount, would receive important aid if he could show in what way, speaking from a human standpoint, He became so familiar with a foreign tongue. Grinfield has endeavoured to account for this remarkable fact, if fact it be, in a particular way on a theory of his own; but the former scholar does not seem to have thought the proof satisfactory, because, except in one place, he makes no reference to it in his work. The objects aimed at by each author, it is true, are different, the one seeking to exalt the Septuagint at all hazards, and the other equally blinded by his preconceived notion, endeavouring to prove that the Greek language was commonly used by Jesus in His public ministrations. The views of each seem to converge to the same point; but the opinion of the former was that Aramaic, as being His native language, was commonly used by Him, while His quotations were usually made from the Septuagint, on the occasions when He used the language. Grinfield held that the residence of Jesus in Nazareth, a city of Galilee, afforded Him special opportunities for becoming acquainted with the Greek language. The harbour of Ptolemais encouraged commerce with foreign nations, and by that means the Septuagint version would become diffused through the surrounding country. Joseph was a mechanic, and the people among whom he lived were a despised race. According to Grinfield, they had lost every vestige of the ancient Hebrew, while their Syro-Phœnician dialect was rugged when compared with that spoken in Judea and Jerusalem. From hence he unwarrantably inferred that Jesus was instructed by His parents, not in Hebrew, but in the Greek version of the Old Testament. He sought to confirm this theory by asserting that Mary in the Magnificat (Luke i. 46-55) employed nothing but expressions taken from the Septuagint, and that nearly all the quotations of Jesus were derived from the same source. This presupposes that Joseph and Mary, being in a humble social position, and at a distance from the coast, had acquired a knowledge of a difficult foreign language to such a degree as to be able to read and give instruction in the Septuagint, and even to compose a sacred hymn in its language, which is as absurd as to suppose an English artisan acquiring a knowledge of a foreign tongue without any adequate motive. The assertion about the Magnificat is worthless, because while it must be admitted that the hymn was probably composed on the model of the song of Hannah, in 1 Sam. ii. 1-10, there is no exact similarity in the ideas or in the language in which they are embodied. It

is much more probable that Mary composed the hymn as an inspired prophetess in her vernacular Aramaic, taking the ideas from the Old Testament, and that the Evangelist when translating it into Greek for the purpose of his narrative, availed himself of the aid of the Greek version. The same explanation neutralizes the argument derived from the supposed close agreement of the quotations in the New Testament from the Septuagint, even if they were admitted to be exact in every case, which they are not, because it is as natural to suppose that an author in the first century would have his authorities at hand to refer to as in the nineteenth or any other age. There are, however, important discrepancies in many cases, while it must not be forgotten that the present Masoretic text and the text of the Septuagint differ widely in several of these quotations and in many other places.

Grinfield, in opposition to Roberts, held that the Sermon on the Mount was originally delivered in the Galilean dialect, and that Jesus used the latter when preaching in the smaller towns and villages, but that when He preached in the synagogues he thought it probable that He spoke in Greek, and used the Greek version. Of the former assertion there is no proof whatever, nor any possible justification, except the desire of the author to magnify the importance of the version he was seeking to exalt. The proof of the latter is based on Luke iv. 17, 18, where it is affirmed that the quotation from Isaiah lxi. 1 agrees with the Septuagint, the truth rather being that the agreement is only general because there are variations, and there is the entire omission from the New Testament of the passage at the end of the section in Isaiah.

The Aramaic expressions of the Saviour (ταλιθα κουμι, Mark v. 41; ἐφθαθά, vii. 34; Ἡλί, ἡλί, λαμὰ σαβαχθανί, Matt. xxvii. 46, and Mark xv. 34) constitute a difficulty which it is not easy to explain. Why did two of the Evangelists give, as is generally believed, His very words on these occasions only? No real attempt has been made by commentators to grapple with it, while the great majority make no allusion to the subject. In reference to Mark v. 41 and vii. 24, Dr. Pfannkuche thought that the preservation of the original terms seemed to be rather accidental than real, because the translators from the Aramaic may have found themselves in the same predicament as the authors of the Septuagint, who occasionally retained, probably from inadvertence, single terms, as *nazir* in Judges xiii. 5, and *Adonai* in *ib.* 8. This may be true, but his translator has noticed that he neglected to observe the peculiarity of the circumstances under which

the  
The  
peop  
ders  
of th  
very  
syna  
jecte  
Willk  
34 in  
the c  
term  
effica  
accu  
Aran  
word  
when  
there  
Evan  
In  
with  
on th  
been  
his m  
gener  
St. M  
Jesus  
not d  
uttere  
mixed  
In  
while  
able t  
nal fo  
was th  
diately  
bystan  
explan  
tongue  
mocke  
Greek  
to reta  
Targu  
by St.  
dressed

as an  
g the  
when  
rative,  
e same  
e sup-  
Testa-  
to be  
as na-  
would  
eteenth  
pancies  
present  
widely  
s.  
mon on  
ect, and  
r towns  
gogues  
d used  
o proof  
esire of  
he was  
n Luke  
a Isaiah  
ing that  
riations,  
ment of

α κοῦμ,  
ολι, Matt.  
which it is  
sts give,  
occasions  
tators to  
usion to  
24, Dr.  
al terms  
e trans-  
s in the  
ho occa-  
e terms,  
his may  
neglected  
er which

the few Aramaic words preserved in the Gospels were uttered. They were not directly addressed in any case to the common people, so that it was of little importance whether they understood them or not. Repp thought that the evident design of the Evangelist was to make his readers acquainted with the very words of Jesus, when raising the daughter of the ruler of the synagogue and healing the deaf and dumb man. Alford rejected as a strange suggestion the explanation of Webster and Wilkinson, that the exact words both here and in Mark vii. 34 indicated that the Saviour used the ordinary language of the country on such occasions, and not any mystical magical term, or sacred word, which the Jews might have thought efficacious; while he believed that Mark's desire to be strictly accurate gave occasion for him to insert the actual Syriac or Aramaic words spoken by Christ. Erasmus supposed that the words addressed to the damsel were a formula in common use when medicines were administered to sick persons, and that therefore the very words of the Saviour were retained by the Evangelist. None of these interpretations are satisfactory.

In the opinion of Lamius, Ephphatha was also preserved with the interpretation attached, that it might be impressed on the memory of the man who was cured, because it had been uttered with a sigh as if in an agony of compassion for his misery. In this, as in the former cases, commentators are generally silent; except that Stier said that the object of St. Mark was to show that in the ordinary intercourse of life Jesus spoke the language of the country: although this will not decide the question as to the language of the discourses uttered before companies of learned and unlearned Jews mixed with Gentiles.

In reference to the words from the cross, Pfannkuche, while holding that Jews always spoke in Aramaic, was only able to conjecture a reason for preserving them in their original form. He thought that they were inserted because light was thereby thrown upon the circumstance mentioned immediately after (*v.* 47), that Jesus was supposed by some of the bystanders to be calling for Elias. Meyer adopted this explanation, observing that the exclamation in the original tongue was fully and naturally explained by their subsequent mockery, which rests upon the similarity of sound. The Greek translator of St. Matthew's Gospel was therefore forced to retain the Aramaic terms, or rather those of the Chaldee Targum, while adding the interpretation, which was also done by St. Mark. Professor Neubauer, holding that Jesus addressed Himself to His disciples and the audience in the

popular Aramaic, thought that this view was established by the terms left in the Gospels by the Greek translators, and especially by His last words on the cross, spoken under circumstances of exhaustion and pain, when a person would naturally make use of his mother tongue.

The common opinion has hitherto been that the Aramaic terms retained by the Evangelists and sometimes expressed in Greek forms, proved that this was the language used by Jesus; but a different view has been put forward by Dr. Roberts, who held that such a method of reasoning was nothing but a *petitio principii*. If the presence of these terms cannot be explained in the ordinary way, he is bound to reconcile them with his theory that the Saviour always spoke in public in the Greek language. Replying to the observation of the late Archbishop Trench, that in each passage the original terms were retained by St. Mark because of their special solemnity, he said that on other occasions, as the stilling of the tempest and the raising of Lazarus, words of equal if not greater solemnity were given in Greek. His explanation of the case of the damsel in Mark v. seems to overturn his own theory. Assuming that Jesus always spoke in His public ministrations in Greek, he said that on this occasion He departed from His usual practice, out of regard to the young woman herself. Her family being Jewish spoke their native Aramaic, with which she was familiar, being too young to have learned as yet a foreign language. Out of tenderness to her, the Saviour spoke the life-giving words in terms she was able to understand, and therefore the Evangelist preserved them as an example of His graciousness. If this explanation be accepted, it will show that Aramaic was the language of the household, and if so Jesus must have spoken in it to the father and mother of the maiden, and to the rest of the company, rather than in a language with which there is no reason to be sure that they were familiar. On the same principle Roberts explained the Ephphatha in Mark vii. 34. He said that the Aramaic was chosen out of regard to the man himself. Supposing him to have been utterly deaf and dumb, he thought that it was in harmony with the circumstances of the case and with the compassion of Jesus, that the first word he heard should be in the native language of the country, and not in Greek. After the impediment had been removed, and the faculty of speech had been given to him, it was the opinion of Roberts that he would have to learn the native language in the ordinary way, because there is no reason to suppose that a miraculous acquaintance with it was communicated to him;

or, s  
abil  
for  
posi  
sage  
whic  
so, t  
the  
the  
nati  
He  
all, y  
rece  
Ara  
Neu  
popu  
I  
cross  
of D  
less  
neith  
quot  
from  
the l  
gelis  
utter  
possi  
two l  
reason  
the v  
least  
becau  
He s  
trans  
on th  
St. M  
'Ewa  
not s  
valen  
of wh  
lation  
about  
G  
and r



or, supposing with Trench and others that the man had partial ability to speak and hear, this furnished an additional reason for speaking to him in Aramaic, with which alone on this supposition he was probably acquainted. The tenor of the passage does not suggest that Jesus spoke Greek to the multitude which brought to Him the deaf and dumb man, or if He did so, that He dropped it when uttering the mandate which was the outward sign of the cure. It is more in harmony with the narrative to suppose that He was in sympathy with the native language of the people who surrounded Him, than that He used a language which was most probably known, if at all, very imperfectly by the men of Galilee.

Some scholars, such as the late Dean Milman, and more recently Lechler and Professor Jowett, have asserted that Aramaic was the only language known to the Galileans. Neubauer thought that in using the term Jesus spoke in the popular dialect.

Roberts's explanation of the cry of the Saviour from the cross, preserved by two of the Evangelists, was that the words of David came naturally to His lips, on which He had doubtless often pondered. This cannot be ascertained, because by neither of them is the cry given in pure Hebrew, or an exact quotation from Psalm xxii., but, according to Pfannkuche, from the Aramaic Targum on the Psalms. The variation in the language of the Seven Words, as given by two of the Evangelists, renders it most improbable that six of them were uttered in Greek, and one only in Aramaic, because it is impossible to believe that Jesus in His agony could have used two languages without any apparent cause, from which it may reasonably be inferred that each of the cries was uttered in the vernacular Aramaic. Roberts held that the Gospels at least are not translations of the Saviour's words into Greek, because there is nowhere in them any intimation to that effect. He said that it was quite gratuitous to imagine that St. John translated the words which Jesus used when He exclaimed on the cross, *τετέλεσται* (chap. xix. 30), any more than St. Mark did so when he recorded His cry in the Aramaic, *Ἐλωὶ ἔλωὶ λαμμὰ σαβαχθανί*. This singular notion does not seem to have been adopted by any commentator, the prevalent opinion being that the former is the Greek rendering of what Jesus actually said. The latter was certainly no translation, but the explanation attempted leaves the difficulty about the two languages unexplained.

Grinfield has fallen into a singular mistake about the first and third of these passages. The vernacular language of

Galilee being Syro-Chaldaic, his view was that it differed so little from the Peshito that no interpretation of the words *Talitha cumi* were necessary, and that the words from the cross not being Biblical Hebrew were equally intelligible. Mark was of a different opinion, because he attached to the former the interpretation, while he and Matthew explained the latter.

However unsatisfactory and tentative are the efforts to explain, on the theory that Jesus always spoke in public and sometimes even in private the Greek language, the Aramaic expressions which on three occasions have been preserved by two of the Evangelists, still less convincing are the other proofs adduced from the Gospels to show that this was the usual tongue in which He addressed Himself to the people, and which must necessarily have been understood by them. The first argument of this sort is derived from the Sermon on the Mount, which Roberts maintained was delivered in Greek. The great multitude who listened is described by St. Matthew as collected from Galilee, Decapolis, Jerusalem, Judea, and from beyond Jordan. While admitting that Jesus spoke more immediately to His disciples, Roberts laid the stress of his argument upon the passage where it is said 'When Jesus had ended all these sayings, the people' (*οἱ ὄχλοι*, Matt. vii. 28) 'were astonished at His doctrine'; from which he inferred that all had been addressed in the discourse, and that all had listened with some degree of intelligence. He did not think that the difficulty about fixing the names of the ten cities was a matter of much importance, because Josephus had affirmed, although long after the Christian era, that they were thoroughly Greek. He added that the region of Decapolis was occupied almost exclusively by heathen settlers or Hellenizing Jews, but furnished no authority for the assertion, from which he further inferred that as the Sermon was intended to be understood, and was actually understood, by the inhabitants of that district, it must have been delivered in Greek. He supported his argument by quoting from the parallel passage in Luke vi. 17, where the Evangelist says that, besides the people mentioned by St. Matthew, some of the multitudes came from the sea-coast of Tyre and Sidon 'to hear Him, and to be healed of their diseases.' He next produced quotations from Josephus to prove that in these regions the Greek and Latin languages were known; from which he somewhat unwarrantably inferred that Greek was the only language used by the natives of the sea-coast of Tyre and Sidon, and again concluded that the Sermon, if it were to be

understood by them, must have been spoken in the Greek tongue. He rejected as ridiculous the idea that the people who lived on the coast could have understood Aramaic; but the Syro-Phœnician woman mentioned in Mark vii. 24 must have spoken this language, because the history does not afford a hint even of Greek being her native tongue. The stress of the argument therefore falls upon the presence of those persons who were present from Decapolis and from the coasts of Tyre and Sidon, whose knowledge of Greek, if it could be established, would entail a knowledge of the same language by the people who came from Galilee, Jerusalem, Judea, and from beyond Jordan. The former Dr. Roberts assumed without sufficient proof, ignoring the evidence that Syro-Phœnician Aramaic was the language prevailing on the west, although it may be freely admitted that some of the inhabitants may have employed Greek for the purposes of trade. That an indiscriminate crowd of people—attracted from different parts of Palestine by the fame of the Saviour's miracles, all understood or even heard a foreign language, is inconceivable; while the history shows that the Sermon was addressed more immediately to the disciples and those who surrounded them. The natural power of the human voice would scarcely enable the Saviour to be heard clearly by the outlying parties, so that the obvious meaning of the Evangelist is that some of the multitudes only heard him distinctly. If the presence of Greek-speaking people from Decapolis and Tyre will prove that Jesus spoke in the Greek language, the same method of argument will equally prove that He spoke in Aramaic, which was the native language of those from Jerusalem, Judea, Galilee, and from beyond Jordan, so that the one assertion balances the other, with much greater probability in favour of the latter, because the assumption that the Jews in these regions understood Greek as well as Aramaic is not supported by any proof. Roberts called this a ruling case, and said that if his position could be decided it would settle the controversy.

Neither can the argument derived by him from the quotations by Christ and those whom He addressed from the Old Testament in favour of his theory be sustained. To the question In what language were they made? he said that there were only three possible answers. He replied that they were either made directly from the Hebrew text, or from the Aramaic Targums, or from the Septuagint. According to him they could not have been made from the first, because the people were not acquainted with the language, and even goes so

far as to assert that for a century previous it was neither written nor spoken, being utterly unknown in the days of Christ to the great majority of the Jews, although he admits that it was then studied by the learned as the language of inspiration. The quotations in the Gospels could not therefore have been made from it. Again, he assumes without proof that the people did not understand the Old Testament at the Christian era, confusing a knowledge of the text with ability to speak the language in a popular sense, in the way that the Aramean was commonly spoken. The latter may be admitted, but the former position is untenable, because there are passages in the Mishna which prove that the select lessons which are specified in the Massorah were read daily by the priests in the religious services of the Temple, and by the readers in the synagogues, and special lessons on the great festivals. That the people in general were well acquainted with the Hebrew text is clear, because in the synagogue services the male Israelites, whether priests or not, were required to take their turn in reading the appointed lessons from the Law and the Prophets and explaining them, as the Saviour did in the synagogue at Nazareth. A knowledge of the language was therefore necessary if a few were to be qualified for this duty; and this caused it to be universally known among the people. Assuming, contrary to the evidence of the Talmud, that Hebrew was not known to the bulk of the Jews in the time of Christ, he asserts that the quotations which occur in the addresses delivered by Him to the multitudes, or which they employed at times in conversation with Him, could not possibly have been in ancient Hebrew; but the only passages which he adduces from the Gospels will prove that the assertion is baseless. At Matt. xxii. 44 the quotation of the Saviour in His question to the Scribes is taken literally from the text of the 110th Psalm. The conversation of the people with the Saviour in John vi. and their quotation from Psalm lxxviii. 24 is the only other illustration adduced to prove the case; but in this instance also the quotation was made correctly from the Hebrew. Roberts observed upon the latter that the people quoted familiarly from the Book of Psalms, but, falling into a *petitio principii*, asserted that it was certainly not in the ancient Hebrew, because it was then utterly unknown to almost the whole body of the nation.

His efforts to prove that the Targum could not have been meant by the Saviour when he said to the Jews 'Search the Scriptures' were superfluous. Whether his views about their

date, authorship, and authority be of any value or not, it is certain that they were only paraphrases of the text of the Old Testament at first given by the interpreters in the synagogues, after the reading of the law and the prophets, being handed down by tradition and depending on the memory for exactness, but afterwards committed to writing as they now exist. They were never called *αἱ γραφαί* by the Jews, and were never erected to the rank of *λόγια*. There is therefore no need to deny that whenever the 'Scriptures' are mentioned in the New Testament the Chaldee Targums are intended.

Having excluded pure Hebrew and Syro-Chaldee as impossible, Roberts asserted that the only possible remaining language was Greek, and that the version from which the quotations were made by Jesus and those who conversed with Him at different times was the Septuagint. If this position be granted it will entail serious difficulties which have never been and cannot be explained. Remembering that the Jews hated Greek, of which there is historical evidence, and that a fast was appointed as a day of humiliation and repentance for the translation of the Old Testament into that language, it seems difficult to believe that it could have been in common use among the people, and even if it were, that they were so well acquainted with it, although in a difficult foreign tongue, as to be able to make quotations from it at pleasure. The variations between them as they stand in the sacred text of the Gospels and in the Septuagint are put aside as causing no serious difficulty, on the ground that they may have been written down by the Evangelists from memory, or with the addition of words intended to add emphasis, or from a text of the latter different from what now exists. That the people quoted the Septuagint from memory is most improbable, and that the inspired writers did so most unlikely, because if the version were available for the use of all, like authors in all ages they would have verified their extracts in reference to matters of such transcendent importance. It has also been supposed that the Evangelists may have made their own translations from the Hebrew, but this will not help the attempt to prove that Greek at the Christian era was universally known among the Jews.

An argument in favour of Greek being the language of the Jews in the time of Christ has been derived by Roberts from the conversation of Jesus with the woman of Samaria. According to him there are passages in the Second Book of the Maccabees and in Josephus which prove that in the reign of

Antiochus Epiphanes the Samaritans revolted from all that was peculiarly Jewish, desiring rather to live according to the customs of the Greeks, including the use of the language, although still retaining their native dialect. The woman affirmed that the Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans; but Roberts for the purpose of his argument assumed that there must have been some necessary intercourse, and then inferred that the Jews would be likely to use the language common to both, from which he thought that the conversation must have been carried on, neither in the Aramaic nor in the Samaritan dialect, but in Greek. He further observed that the Evangelist took special care to report it accurately in whatever language it may have been spoken, laying the stress of his argument on the parenthetic sentence in *v.* 25, 'I know that Messiah cometh, which is called Christ.' If it were uttered by the woman he thought that the question was settled. If it were the explanation of the Evangelist he would account for its insertion by the desire of St. John to preserve his accuracy while reporting the very terms employed. Why, he asks, did he make the woman speak of Christ and not Messiah in *v.* 29, and the men of the city in *v.* 42 describe Him as *ὁ Χριστός*, 'the Saviour of the world'? It is therefore obvious, as he thought, that St. John represents the Samaritans as employing the term *Χριστός*, and that they would not have done this if they had not used Greek; from which he inferred that the language must have been known among the Samaritans. The probability becomes certainty according to him, when the Hellenic tendencies of the Samaritans are remembered, and thus there arises another undoubted proof that Jesus on this occasion spoke Greek.

This is by no means so clear as he would have his readers suppose. It must be remembered that the exact words of the conversation were heard by only two persons, because the disciples were absent, and that, when relating the purport of it to them on their return, it is most unlikely that the Saviour used the explanatory clause. The Evangelist more probably himself inserted it, when writing his Gospel long after, as the first aspect of the passage seems to suggest. On the other hand, Alford and others thought them to be the words of the woman and not of the Evangelist. The former supposed that the term *ὁ Χριστός* may have found its way among the Samaritans in the same manner as other Greek words and names had been incorporated in the language. If this opinion be well founded, the reasoning of Roberts falls to the ground; albeit it is only an inferential proof of his main position.



The proofs from the Gospels that Jesus in His public addresses always used the Greek language fail to establish the point when submitted to a searching examination. The special arguments derived from the Acts of the Apostles to show that they also spoke Greek in their public ministrations prove to be equally unreliable. The assertion, not sustained by any real proof, that St. Peter delivered his addresses in Greek on the day of Pentecost to the large assemblage of native and foreign Jews, is contradicted by the narrative in the Acts and by the facts of the case. If three thousand were baptized after the address, it is reasonable to suppose that a much larger number was present, the whole of whom could not have heard or understood what he said, because the power of the human voice is limited, so that there must, therefore, have been other speakers. While many of the foreign Jews and proselytes who had come up to the feast may have understood Greek, it is equally probable that many from the remote countries specified in the narrative were ignorant of it. Neubauer pertinently asks: Why should the men of Cappadocia, Pontus, Asia, Phrygia, Pamphylia, and other distant countries be astonished that the Apostles spoke Greek if it had been their usual language? Will anyone venture seriously to affirm that Peter spoke Greek when he addressed himself to the 'men of Judea and all that dwell at Jerusalem' at Pentecost, when all the prayers were offered in Hebrew? How would the Medes, Elamites, and Arabians have understood him if he had spoken Greek? What else do the words 'Are not all these which speak Galileans?' mean but that the Apostles usually spoke to the people in the Galilean dialect? The use of the term 'tongues' by St. Luke proves that a variety of languages or dialects were spoken by those who addressed the multitude, so that, if Greek were employed by St. Peter in his address, it is possible, but only an assumption not supported by any proof. This is also clear from the previous sentence, where it is said that the multitude came together and were confounded, because that every man heard them speak in his own language, the reference being to the hundred and twenty who began to speak with other tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance. The others mentioned in *v.* 13 were probably native Jews who did not understand foreign languages, which affords an argument against the prevalence of Greek in Palestine. It has never occurred to any commentator to propound the idea that Greek was spoken by the Apostles on the day of Pentecost.

An argument in favour of the prevalence of Greek in

Palestine has been derived from the distinction drawn in Acts vi. between the Hebrews and Grecians (Grecian Jews, 'Hellenists,' Marg. R. V.), the inference being that the latter were not acquainted with the language of the country, and therefore that they had synagogues of their own in which the Septuagint and Targums were used instead of the original Hebrew text. The term Hellenist meant, according to some authorities, a person who differed in principle and tendency from the old and exclusive Hebrews. He belonged to the liberal school, while the Hebrew belonged to the bigoted party, whether within or without the Church, the most of those who understood Aramaic being 'Εβραῖοι, although some of the Ἕλληνες were also acquainted with the language, while both were so familiar with Greek as to be able to hold such intercourse with each other by means of it as is implied in the history in Acts vi. Roberts, on this occasion following Grinfield, says that St. Paul was a Hellenist, although the Apostle never calls himself by this name, being rather described as a Hebrew of the Hebrews or a Jew. The assertion that the Hellenists in Palestine had synagogues for their special use, because they understood only Greek, is improbable, because those who hold this opinion have not been able to prove that it was customary for the Jews who lived among the Greeks to have the Scriptures publicly read in the Alexandrian version. That the Septuagint version ever had any public authority is nothing but a conjecture founded upon a particular interpretation of the ambiguous term Hellenist, and is not supported by a single decisive historical fact, while it is contradicted by the circulation of the Targums among the Jews of Palestine.

The theory that the mention of the Hellenists in the Acts as residing in Jerusalem, warrants the opinion that the Jews who lived in Palestine in the time of the Apostles were well acquainted with Greek, cannot be sustained. It depends on the interpretation of the term which takes Ἑλληνίζω as meaning 'to speak Greek,' which is its primary and classical meaning. If this be the sense in which the word is used in the Acts, it is remarkable that the Jews who lived in Asia Minor, in Greece, or in any of the other countries where the Greek language prevailed, are never in it called Hellenists. Even Paul, who was born in Tarsus, a Greek city, was never so called, while he somewhat ostentatiously avoided the designation as applicable to himself, notwithstanding the rhetorical assertion of Grinfield that, charmed by the example of Jesus in quoting the Septuagint, he forgot the Pharisee, and became

the Hellenist. Besides it was the custom of the Jews to divide all the world into Jews and Greeks, the latter including both those nations which, although not Greeks, were under the rule of Greek sovereigns, and the nations which spoke Aramaic, such as the Syrians and Syro-Phœnicians. If the meaning of the term Hellenist be derived from its application in this latter sense, when used in the Acts it must mean proselytes, or the descendants of proselytes, of heathen origin, who were held in contempt by Jews of pure Hebrew descent. The Aramaic proselytes and their children were therefore quite as much Hellenists as those of Greek and Roman descent, of whom there could never have been more than a small minority in Palestine. Even if there were among them Jews who were acquainted with Greek, it is extremely improbable that they had so little knowledge of the vernacular Aramaic as to render it necessary for the Saviour and the Apostles to always address them in the former language. The Jews who emigrated from their native country to other lands always formed themselves into colonies, isolated from the other inhabitants by their religion and usages, and avoiding all close connexion and intercourse with them. They cared only so far to learn the language as to render themselves intelligible to the people among whom they lived for the purposes of trade, while the frequent journeys to Jerusalem to keep the feasts required by the Jewish law, and their intercourse with their brethren in Palestine, contributed powerfully to keep up among them a knowledge of the Aramaic language. Even if their knowledge of pure Hebrew had degenerated among the Jews settled in foreign countries, they would still be able to understand the vernacular Palestinian Syriac, which could not become so unintelligible to them as to render necessary the building of special synagogues for their use. There is therefore no good reason for thinking that the synagogue which was occupied by the Libertines was distinguished from the others in Jerusalem by the use of the Greek language.

These considerations seem to show that the assertion that the apology of Stephen delivered before the Sanhedrim must have been in the Greek language, is not so strongly supported by evidence as to render it credible. The defence was also spoken apparently in presence of the multitude, from which the inference has been drawn that they must have understood Greek, which assumes that the first martyr used that language, and not the vernacular Aramaic, ignoring the possibility of a subsequent translation by St. Luke. Grinfield, without affirming that the speech was in Greek, said that it contained no less

than twenty-eight distinct quotations from the Septuagint, in which must be included quotations from the Rabbinic tradition. Roberts thought that it bore plain evidence of having been spoken in Greek, because of the cento of extracts which it contained. While these generally agree in meaning with the Greek version, in other cases they differ from it both in substance and in form. He attempted to get over this most serious difficulty by holding it to be most improbable that Luke adopted the Septuagint version, while Stephen really made his quotations from the Hebrew, or that the latter, when making his extracts for the purpose of his history, altered them as they stand in the Greek form of the speech. He thought that one or other of those improbabilities must be maintained by those who hold that Stephen spoke in Aramaic, and added that there were probably few who would be inclined to adopt either alternative in preference to the natural conclusion that he used the Greek language. Speaking of the quotations from the Septuagint in Luke iv., and their deviations in several places from the Hebrew, and of the present Greek text from both, Olshausen thought that it was no disparagement to the writers of the New Testament to say that they dealt very freely by those of the Old. With memories uncertain and wavering like other men, confusing passages and mistaking words, the Spirit who inspired and led them so managed all that nothing untrue, nothing that might mislead has resulted, while the truth itself is rather presented in a new aspect, and its real nature more clearly revealed. On the apology of Stephen he observes that it contains many references to Rabbinical tradition, which renders it probable that ancient genuine elements were preserved traditionally among the Jews, which received their higher confirmation by admission into the New Testament. This opinion, which is supported by various places in the New Testament (Matt. xxii. 31-33, Acts xiii. 34) goes a long way toward explaining the variations in it. Alford thought, without any evidence, that Stephen was a Hellenist, and that the speech was delivered in Greek, because the citations and quasi-citations for the most part agree with the Septuagint. If he spoke in Aramaic, either those passages where it varies from the Hebrew must owe their insertion in that shape to some Greek narrator, or to Luke himself; or else Stephen when speaking must have freely translated them, probably from memory, thus varying into Aramaic: either supposition being, according to him, highly improbable.

Roberts further asserted that the accusers of Stephen were

unquestionably men to whom the Greek language only was vernacular, because the foreign Jews from Cyrene, Alexandria, and elsewhere, were accustomed to use Greek only, being ignorant of Aramaic, contrary to what has been already said. If those men who had been disputing with him were present at the trial before the Sanhedrim, the apology must have been in Greek, otherwise it would have been unintelligible to them. He also inferred from the passage that Stephen was in the habit of employing the same language, because he belonged to the Hellenists, and was thus brought into collision with those Jews who, although speaking Greek, were identified with the bigoted section of their countrymen, and had on this account accused him. As the parties had been accustomed to dispute together in Greek, the speech which he now delivered would therefore also be in the same language. In these statements there are so many assumptions without proof, that if they are eliminated the whole reasoning will collapse. There is no evidence whatever that the Jews from Cyrene, Alexandria, and other places, were ignorant of the vernacular Aramaic; that Stephen was a Hellenist; or that he commonly spoke Greek, and had previously used it when disputing with his Hebrew opponents.

Even if the assumption that he used Greek were granted, it would involve difficulties which cannot easily be explained. It assumes without evidence that the common people of Jerusalem understood a foreign language sufficiently well to understand a speaker discoursing in it, and that the Sanhedrim were content to listen to a defence delivered before them in Greek, which they detested and despised, in the holy city of Jerusalem, and before a court in which the pleadings were carried on in the vernacular Aramaic. On the other hand, assuming that Stephen spoke in the latter language, and that Luke derived his knowledge of the substance of the speech from Saul or some other Christian who may have been present, everything in the story becomes natural, while the difficulties about the quotations are considerably lessened. Notwithstanding these and the possible counter-theory, Roberts held that this case was absolutely decisive of the question as far as the Acts of the Apostles affords evidence—that Greek was commonly employed for all public purposes in Palestine at the Christian era.

In the cases which have been specified, and in others, the advocates of the prevalence of Greek in Palestine in the time of Christ and the Apostles have illogically taken up, in the absence of all evidence in the New Testament, the difficult

position of first assuming the point in dispute, and then attempted to reconcile it with different examples which they find in the Gospels and Acts. The obvious reply is either to show that they cannot be fitted to the theory, or that it is more, or at least equally, natural to suppose that, while the vernacular Aramaic was the popular language commonly used by Christ and His Apostles, Greek may have been known to a few of the better educated Jews, and super-naturally, or otherwise, to the inspired men who wrote the different books of the New Testament.

---

ART. VII.—THE LIFE AND WORK OF LORD  
SHAFTESBURY.

*The Life and Work of Lord Shaftesbury.* By EDWIN  
HODDER. (London, 1886.)

IT is difficult, on various accounts, to describe or to review fully the life of Lord Shaftesbury. This is not caused by any differences which we may feel with some of his opinions. Such we no doubt entertain, but they are comparatively insignificant when compared with the admiration with which we regard his character, and what was infinitely the greatest part of his work. The difficulty in describing his life is in fact that which constitutes its interest—the great variety and importance of his work, and the intense energy with which he did it—the spectacle, in a word, of a great public character, of a man born in the highest position in society, and unquestionably possessed of splendid talents, devoting them, from almost his earliest days to the end of a very long life, entirely to the service of God and man. Such a spectacle is in reality almost unique in our history. We have had distinguished Christian philanthropists before—the great man of whom we are about to speak may be considered as the last of the trio beginning with Howard and Wilberforce; and the one achievement which will be for ever connected with the name of Wilberforce—the suppression of the slave trade—has a world-wide reputation which is beyond that of any single action of Lord Shaftesbury. But for a long continuity of unceasing labour, devoted almost entirely to the highest good of the poorer classes of his own countrymen,



and then  
which they  
either to  
that it is  
while the  
commonly  
ve been  
super-  
rote the

LORD

EDWIN

to review  
ed by any  
ns. Such  
significant  
ve regard  
art of his  
that which  
rtance of  
id it—the  
of a man  
questionably  
almost his  
he service  
unique in  
philanthro-  
peak may  
n Howard  
will be for  
oppression  
is beyond  
for a long  
ely to the  
untrymen,

and thus having an especially English character, the life and work of Lord Shaftesbury seems to us unequalled by that of any other man, in a position at all similar, either in our own or any other country. Nor is the difficulty of describing this adequately diminished by what is a great charm of this work, its almost autobiographical character. For Lord Shaftesbury recorded most of the facts, and not a few of the feelings, of his life in his journals, and these let us into his real mind on almost every important social and political subject for a period of nearly sixty years, to an extent and in a manner to which we really know no parallel. In them we have the whole man, or, according to one of his last requests, 'the reality, good or bad, and no sham;' we have, in fact, a genuine Christian hero, one whose very faults were of the heroic and the Christian type, knowing from first to last no selfish objects, but living (so far as it could be said of any man) up to his own high ideal of purity and self-devotion, and drawing his whole strength from constant prayer to God. Such a man is one of the truest glories and the best sources of strength to a nation, and all the more so because he may be almost said to have lived for the especial purpose of struggling against, if not entirely vanquishing, some of the gigantic evils of his country's overgrown greatness and civilization. This may be described as the general character of Lord Shaftesbury's life, and if there are important points where we hold him to have been in error, we may well add that few men have ever more truly deserved the words—

'Sanctus haberi,  
Justitiæque tenax, factis dictisque mereris.'

It was certainly by a curious irony of fate that the first of Lord Shaftesbury's ancestors who bore his name was 'the false Achitophel:'

'Of these the false Achitophel was first,  
A name to all succeeding ages curst;'

whose political infamy is scarcely modified by Dryden's splendid testimony to his equity as a judge:—

'In Israel's courts ne'er sat an Abethdin,  
With more discerning eyes, or hands more clean:  
Unbribed, unsought, the wretched to redress,  
Swift of despatch, and easy of access.'

But though neither he nor the third Earl, the author of the *Characteristics*, have lacked their apologists, the truest glory of this great house will in the end rest with him who, accord-

ing to the telling eulogy of Shiel in 1838, 'has added nobility even to the name of Ashley, and made humanity the highest of Shaftesbury's *Characteristics*.' Antony Ashley-Cooper, who became the seventh Earl, was born in Grosvenor Square on April 28, 1801, his mother being a daughter of the fourth Duke of Marlborough, and his father, Cropley, the sixth Earl, holding—nearly till his death at eighty—the place of Chairman of Committees in the House of Lords. The history of his childhood and early youth, which was no secret during his life, and which, indeed, he has described himself, was a melancholy one: 'I and my sisters,' he says, 'were brought up with great severity, moral and physical, the opinion of our parents being that, to render a child obedient, it should be in constant fear of its father and mother.' The person to whom he owed everything was a pious and devoted housekeeper, who was almost more than a mother to him, to whom he traced his first impressions of religion, and 'many of whose sentences of prayer, which she made him repeat on his knees,' he recalled in his old age. He wore to the last a watch and gold chain which she had given him. At seven he was sent to a school—one of those dens of iniquity, 'just like Dotheboys Hall,' he says, which were strangely common in those days; 'nothing could have surpassed it for filth, bullying, neglect, and hard treatment of every sort'—and which had no 'single compensating advantage, except that it gave him a hatred of oppression and cruelty.' He spent there five unprofitable years of misery, when to his great joy he was sent to Harrow, then flourishing, though after a somewhat curious fashion, under Dr. Butler, the father of the present Master of Trinity. Here one or two characteristic anecdotes are told of him, though what was perhaps the most amusing is omitted, for the family legend of him is that he was sent away for maliciously upsetting the cart of a respectable Methodist. If it was so, he paid the penalty by being transferred to the house of a relation, a well-to-do dignified clergyman, where 'no two years were perhaps ever so misspent . . . nevertheless,' he adds, 'there were floating in my mind all sorts of aspirations, though I never took a step to make their fulfilment possible.'

The real stuff that was in him was first shown at Oxford, to which he long looked back with deep gratitude as his true Alma Mater: 'My feelings to her,' he said twelve years afterwards, 'are now deep, tender, reverential, and, as time has proved, steadfast. To her I must ascribe *all* that I have of learning, and *much* that I may have of virtue. . . . Shall I not then love her, pray for her, and if possible befriend her?'

(i. 198). But few indeed have been the young 'tufts,' considering his backwardness at starting, who have profited by Oxford as Lord Ashley did. 'Do you intend to take a degree?' was the first question of his tutor—a name long famous at Christ Church, the well-known Vowler Short, for whom he always retained respect and affection. 'I cannot say, but I will try,' was the answer. His literary ability, for which he was always marked, soon showed itself. He read the 'Ethics' with Pusey, a young Etonian of his own standing, and afterwards says modestly, 'I have had a great many surprises in life, but I don't think I was ever more surprised than when I took Honours'—he took a First in Classics—at Oxford. That he had been duly impressed with terror at the ordeal may be inferred from the fact that he says more than once, whenever he had 'a nightmare,' 'I went up of course for my degree at Oxford.'

This was in 1822, when he was not yet twenty-two years old, and the following ten years strengthened, if they did not lay, the foundations of his character and career. Of the earlier years there is little detail, except a touch of romance, which, as he himself freely divulges it, we need not scruple to repeat. 'An attachment,' he says, 'during my residence at Vienna, commenced a course of self-knowledge for me. Man never has loved more furiously or more imprudently. The object was, and is, an angel; but she was surrounded by, and would have brought with her, a halo of hell' (i. 56). From this, however, he seems to have recovered before he was returned to Parliament in June 1826 for Woodstock, then the pocket borough of his uncle the Duke of Marlborough. From the very first he was a marked character in the House, partly from his natural fervour, and partly from his manifest sincerity and power. He is almost 'maddened by delight and enthusiasm' with one of Canning's great speeches. He 'cannot sleep for agitation,' and on writing in this strain to Mrs. Canning, receives from her an answer in kind, to the effect that 'next to the speech of last night your note is the most eloquent effusion of feeling I ever met with,' and she assures him that 'in reading it both Mr. Canning and myself found our eyes in that state of overflow in which you describe your own to have nearly been on hearing the speech' (i. 59). This is pretty well from a Prime Minister to a young man of twenty-five; and fortunately Mrs. Canning never heard of a rather characteristic entry in the journal, about a month later, 'How we change! Now I think Canning's speech a little imprudent,' otherwise a speedy offer of office might not have been made. He soon,

however, fell off from Canning to Mr. Peel and the Duke of Wellington, or 'Dukey' as he called him, the last of whom treated him in his early days with an affection which he seldom showed to young men, while his first feelings towards Peel were very different from the almost entire disbelief which he afterwards repeatedly expresses: 'I like Peel. I love honesty and truth. I hear that he and Dukey speak most highly of me. I never shall want more than the praises of true gentlemen' (i. 69). The result of this mutual admiration was an offer from the Duke in 1828 of a commissionership on the Indian Board of Control, which he held till Lord Grey came in in 1830; and where he was at once 'denounced by his colleagues as a madman' for proposing to put down Sutteeism—but he used his patronage nobly. His very first offer was that of a writership to Southey for his son; and 'the acceptance of this,' he added, 'will not place you under any obligation to me; it is *due* to a man who has done so much by his writings to extend the knowledge of true philosophy, and impress upon the world the consolation and practice of religion.' Well might Southey answer, in declining this offer gratefully, that 'nothing more utterly unexpected, or more gratifying, has ever occurred to me,' and it quickly led to a warm attachment, which must have helped to cheer the last sad years of poor Southey's decline. His work was not as yet so absorbing as to prevent him from giving much of his time both to literature and to science. He had accomplished the somewhat singular feat of learning Welsh a year or two before, and had begun, though he did not continue, the study of Hebrew. Of science, and particularly astronomy, he was also a devoted student, spending night after night in Sir James South's observatory, and in his own words, 'so passionately was I devoted to science, that I was almost disposed to pursue it to the exclusion of everything else.' Of a young aristocrat of this type we can hardly wonder that all his friends (except, unfortunately, his father) were proud; and that many echoed, both as to physical and moral qualities, the lively feelings of two young lady cousins, which he confesses to have rather touched his vanity: 'They call me and William' (his younger brother) 'the Sublime and Beautiful.' The praise, or banter, was certainly in each case most appropriate; for a more winning form and attractive character than that of William Ashley, to the last day of his life, cannot be imagined.

We have thus far been necessarily led to a summary of Lord Ashley's early life, but the interest of his journal is so great that we must allow him in one or two passages

to describe himself according to the feelings of his early years :—

' 1826, April 28. My birthday, and now I am twenty-five years old—a great age for one who is neither wise, nor good, nor useful, nor endowed with capability of becoming so. People would answer me, "Why, you have not lost your time, you have been always engaged;" quite true, but always upon trifles; indeed, since my quitting Oxford, a space now of three years . . . not a study commenced, not an object pursued, not a good deed done, not a good thought generated; for my visions are too unsteady for the honour of that title. Visions without end, but, God be praised, all of a noble character. . . . No man had ever more ambition, and probably my seeming earnestness for great and good purposes was merely a proof of hotter ambition and deeper self-deception than exists in others. That I am not completely in despair must come from God, who knows—

"Quæ sint, quæ fuerint, quæ mox ventura trahantur"

—and who, if He wanted me, or knew that I could be useful, would doubtless call me forward. All that I can remark then is, that I will entreat Him to call up for Old Britain young and aged saints and sinners, high and low, rich and poor, who may act as well for her interests as I always fancied I wished to do; but, as I said before, that was likely to be a self-error' (i. 55).

The same complaints of failure, 'impetuosity,' 'silly ebullition of sentiment;' 'The country can hardly make any use of me, hopeless ass that I am;' 'I read, think, make every endeavour, but no result comes from it;' 'Cicero opened his pleadings at twenty-six, my age (but *quantum distat*). Scipio was Consul at twenty-four, Pitt Prime Minister at twenty-three; I have not done one good thing, nor acquired the power of doing one good thing which could be serviceable to my country, or an honour to myself'—all this was strongly the tone of Lord Ashley's mind in earlier life. It was apparently derived in great measure from the parentless solitude of his boyish days, and it clung to him down to his latest years. 'My temperament,' he writes in 1860, 'is painfully susceptible; I am very soon elated and as rapidly depressed, both in extremes; at one moment in the highest joy, then in the deepest despair' (iii. 114). But while his long record of himself reveals to us the inmost thoughts of a powerful and deeply religious mind, it cannot be denied that it is pervaded by an intensity and morbidness of temperament, and is open to the charge, from which few religious journals on so large a scale can be free, of deifying his own feelings. We shall see more of the defective side of this in his later life; in his earlier days we must confess that the rare spectacle, in

England at least, of a young man in the highest public life who bares his heart so unreservedly, is, even as a mere psychological study, singularly attractive; we know no other journal which for nearly sixty years gives us such outspoken opinions, often indeed mistaken, and sometimes inconsistent, but always high-principled, on almost every great event and every great character of our history.

But the real work of Lord Ashley's life was, in 1830, still to come. We have seen him, with natural impetuosity, swing from science to literature, 'hoping that he should rival many in mental accomplishments,'<sup>1</sup> and tempted by offers, which were often repeated in life, of political advancement; but 'do what I would,' he wrote long afterwards, 'I was called to another career'—and his happy marriage to Lady Emily Cowper in 1830 in no respect tended to repress his ardour. It is worth while to draw attention to some peculiar features of the time at which he began his work, for the period from 1830 to 1840 or 1845 was one when, with the great and feverish energy in Politics which followed the first Reform Bill, many of the best minds of the country were awakening to the fact that social reforms were even more pressing. Men so different as Southey, Carlyle, and Arnold, were all expressing, in their different ways, their sense of the appalling condition into which, in the midst and as a consequence of all our wealth, the lower classes of England both in town and country were drifting. 'I would give anything,' wrote Dr. Arnold, with his strong political instinct, 'to be able to organize a society for drawing public attention to the state of the labouring classes throughout the kingdom. Men do not think of the fearful state in which we are living.' While Southey adds that 'nothing more inhuman than the present factory system has ever disgraced human nature.' A state of things had in fact grown up which could not justly be laid to the charge of any individuals, but was the necessary growth of our vast system of manufactures (chiefly cotton), which, after the great inventions of the eighteenth century, had required the employment of large numbers of children, who, not only in the large towns themselves, but from all parts of the country, were packed off in wagon-loads to work almost as slaves, and often to die, in the manufactories. Its evils had early (in the century) attracted the attention of some of the best manufacturers themselves; but the efforts of the first Sir Robert Peel had barely succeeded in reducing the work of all young persons

<sup>1</sup> *Life*, i. 89.



in factories, under sixteen years of age, to twelve hours in the day. It was in 1832 that the struggle really began, when the 'Ten Hours Bill' was first started by Mr. Michael Thomas Sadler, then member for Newark (father of the well-known writer, Canon Sadler), whose remarkable eloquence thoroughly roused the House of Commons on the subject. To him Lord Ashley always assigned the honour of having bravely led the forlorn hope. Mr. Sadler, however, lost his seat, and a small deputation from the Committee of the Yorkshire and Lancashire Labourers waited upon Lord Ashley to request him to take up the question. 'I can perfectly recollect,' he says, 'my astonishment, and doubt, and terror at the proposition' (i. 149). His friend, Sir James Scarlett (afterwards Lord Abinger), and some others advised him to undertake it. 'I returned home, armed with their opinions, to decide for myself after meditation and prayer, and "divination" (as it were) by the word of God.' It was, indeed, no light sacrifice that was proposed to him. His political prospects were extremely bright; he was a poor man, with a young wife and child, and placed in circumstances which continued through life—though without any fault of his own—of considerable pecuniary difficulty; and, lastly, he saw from the first that in espousing this cause he was practically devoting his life to the cause of the poor, to the sacrifice of many of the dearest enjoyments of home. He laid the matter, we are told, before his young wife, painted in strong, dark colours the sacrifice which it would involve, and told her to decide. 'It is your duty,' she said, 'and the consequences we must leave. Go forward, and to victory.' And the great struggle of the Factory Bill which now ensued was unquestionably the chief achievement of his political life; it was a contest with the most wealthy interests, and with nearly all the leading statesmen in England; and it more than once nearly destroyed a powerful ministry. It was, in a word, the greatest social contest of the century, and may be called the purest popular victory, won by a determined aristocrat. It lasted seventeen years, from 1833 to 1850, and, after being opposed with the utmost bitterness by Tories, Whigs, and Radicals alike, it was at last carried in a chorus of unanimous applause. There are few men in our history of whom such a record can be made.

I. The chief epochs of the Bill were in 1832, 1838, 1840, 1844, 1847 (when it was carried by Mr. Fielden, Lord Ashley being then out of Parliament), and 1850, when it was carried in its final form of ten and a half hours by Lord Ashley. Its object

may be described simply enough. It provided for the limitation of the hours of labour, 'for women and children,' to ten hours a day; and as time went on clauses were added which required the attendance of children at school. The first opposition to it was in 1832, when it was thrown out by a Bill of Lord Althorp's, containing, as Lord Ashley afterwards allowed, 'some humane and highly useful provisions,' and providing especially that 'no child who should not have completed his or her eleventh year of age should work for more than nine hours in any factory or mill.' The question slept for the next two or three years, Lord Ashley employing himself in the interval in minute inquiries and personal visits to the colliery districts.

'I made it an invariable rule,' he says, 'to see everything with my own eyes, to take nothing on trust or hearsay. In factories I examined the mills, the machinery, the homes, and saw the workers and their work in all its details. In collieries I went down into the pits. In London I went into the lodging-houses, and thieves' haunts, and every filthy place. It gave me a power I could not otherwise have had . . . for I used often to hear things from the poor sufferers themselves, which were invaluable to me. I got to know their habits of thought and action, and their actual wants. I sat and had tea with them hundreds of times' (i. 165).

Fortified by this experience he was prepared to deal with the next Bill which was brought in by the Whigs (by Mr. Poulett Thompson, M.P. for Manchester), in 1836, to repeal the test clauses of Lord Althorp's Act, which he at once denounced as an attempt 'to legalize the slavery of forty thousand children, for the most part females; a more faithless proposal was never made to the integrity and understanding of a legislature.' This, though backed by the whole influence of the Ministry, only obtained a majority of two in a house of 354 members, and was withdrawn. It was the real opening of the battle; and in June 1838 Lord Ashley once more proposed to introduce a 'ten hours' clause,' with a charge against the Government that they had 'deluded and mocked him' with false promises, to which Lord J. Russell retorted that 'Lord Ashley was under a delusion *which he had created for himself*, if he supposed that a great many children suffered under the infliction of grievances' (i. 223). By this time, however, public attention was thoroughly roused, and Lord Ashley found some vigorous supporters—one in Sir William Napier, another in Charles Dickens, who assured him of his zealous assistance, and, last not least, in the *Times*, which it may be well to quote as showing the strong feeling on the subject.

'The public attention,' it says (on June 25, 1838), 'cannot be too forcibly directed to the scandalous conduct of the Melbourne Ministry with regard to the Factory Question, as exposed by Lord Ashley in his most impressive and striking speech. It was not merely that the noble Lord, to whom parents and children, and the cause of humanity, are all alike and so deeply indebted—it is not merely, we say, that he has himself been "mocked and deluded" in the prosecution of his benevolent schemes by the broken faith and callous feelings of this mercenary and jobbing clique, but that laws of their own making have been left unenforced, and the unfortunate children unprotected, and that "all the representations and remonstrances made to the Ministers on the subject have been treated with total neglect and contempt"' (i. 222).

Lord Ashley's motion was however lost; 121 voting for ministers and 106 against them.

II. Such were the first steps of the factory question under the Melbourne Whig Administration. They had contrived to baffle it, and Lord Melbourne himself had pointed out Lord Shaftesbury to the Queen with his usual banter: 'There, Madam, is the greatest Jacobin in your dominions.' The Peel Ministry came in in 1841, and Sir Robert Peel, whose opinion of Lord Ashley's efforts was, *mutatis mutandis*, not so very different from that of Lord Melbourne, would gladly have shut his mouth and gained the support of his character and popularity by offering him first the office of Lord High Treasurer, and later that of Secretary for Ireland, and ultimately that of Lord-Lieutenant—as Lord Palmerston afterwards offered him a seat in the Cabinet. The rejection of such offers was always, on the grounds of political duty, a matter of difficulty to Lord Ashley, and later in life (in 1854) he was only saved from taking office, under the influence of his wife and Lady Palmerston, by what he politely calls 'a ram caught in the thicket,' *i.e.* Lord Harrowby, who averted Isaac's sacrifice. 'His heart leapt with joy,' he tells us, 'and it was as distinctly an act of special Providence as when the hand of Abraham was stayed, and Isaac saved.' On this occasion, however, he did not waver an instant; his account of the matter is worth quoting.

'I told him [Sir R. Peel] I had intentionally compromised myself, and that while I was ready to serve as shoe-black for the interests of a Conservative Government, I would not abate my principles by the breadth of a hair. He said he did not know the *present* position of the Factory Question. I told him. "I can talk to you about it another time," he said, and dismissed me coldly' (i. 351).

The fact is, his opinion of Sir Robert Peel, regarded as a minister of high public principle, was certainly low, and it is

given in a full-length character, part of which is worth quoting.

'This statesman's career,' he says, 'is without precedent in the history of politicians : he has begun by opposing and ended by carrying (not simply supporting) almost every great question of the day. He has availed himself of the virtues and vices, the wisdom and the prejudices, the desires and fears, of his friends and adherents : for them, or against them, as his purposes required. He denounced "party" that he might set up "Peelism," led the Tories, and followed the Whigs, holding power in the first and seeking praise in the second. His opinions, I suspect, have ever been discordant with his conduct. He thought with Canning on the Roman Catholic question, but acquired consequence, distinction, power, and a party, by heading the resistance to it. When resistance had become troublesome, and raised impediments in his way, he changed his front, developed his opinions, seduced some of his followers, and browbeat the others' (ii. 138).

He did fuller justice to Peel's many great qualities on his death, as indeed he did to almost everyone whom he had attacked in their lives.

The three following years (1842 to 1844), which practically settled the factory question, were undoubtedly the most important and critical in Lord Ashley's public life. The most decisive victory that he ever won, and perhaps the most convincing of all his speeches, was on the Mines and Collieries Bill, which was the result of a commission which he had moved for in 1840. The abuses connected with the employment of children in mines presented an even clearer case than those in factories, and formed indeed a list of nearly unmitigated horrors. We will not now repeat the sufferings of the narrow passages in the mines, the management of which was then very different from what it is now, the boys and girls alike working with the 'girdle and chain' round their waists, the little children pumping up the water standing ankle-deep at the bottom of the pits, the miserable and disgusting condition of seminudity of girls and women, the children of six or seven years old dragging, fourteen times a day, burdens of half a hundredweight up steps which equalled the ascent to the summit of St. Paul's, all education being in the meanwhile totally neglected. Even Sir Robert Peel said in his calm way, 'The evidence could not be resisted ; though I shall be a great sufferer, I assure you I have not offered the slightest impediment.' ('He ought to have co-operated vigorously,' is Lord Ashley's natural remark.) This whole system was brought to light by Lord Ashley in a speech<sup>1</sup> which, as it is

<sup>1</sup> June 8, 1842.

truly  
He s  
the s

'A  
words  
good  
mom  
I hea  
and t  
told V  
than a  
"Nor  
above  
knowi  
Thee  
couns  
and o  
It has  
hopes  
the iss

T  
proof  
in her

'My d  
'I  
as to s  
well a  
before  
fore w  
arduou  
papers  
the wh  
the Qu  
sympat  
'E

TH  
their i  
Ashley  
'May  
my m  
But it  
diately

truly remarked, sent a thrill of horror through the country. He spoke for upwards of two hours, and his own account of the scene is so striking that it would be unjust not to quote it.

'As I stood at the table, and just before I opened my mouth, the words of God came forcibly to my mind—"Only be strong and of a good courage;" praised be His holy name, I was as easy from that moment as though I had been sitting in an armchair. Many men, I hear, shed tears—Beckett Denison confessed to me that he did, and that he left the House lest he should be seen. Sir G. Grey told William Cowper that he "would rather have made that speech than any he ever heard." . . . I must and will sing an everlasting "Non nobis." Grant, O blessed God, that I may not be exalted above measure, but that I may ever creep close by the ground, knowing and joyfully confessing that I am Thy servant, that without Thee I am nothing worth, and that from Thee alone cometh all counsel, wisdom, and understanding, for the sake of our most dear and only Saviour, God manifest in the flesh, our Lord Jesus Christ! It has given me hopes for the Empire, hopes for its permanence, hopes for its service for the purposes of the Messiah. God prosper the issue!' (i. 421).

The following generous letter<sup>1</sup> from Prince Albert is a proof that the Queen quite understood the 'greatest Jacobin in her dominions':—

'Buckingham Palace, June 23, 1842.

'My dear Lord Ashley,

'I have carefully perused your speech which you were so good as to send me, and I have been highly gratified by your efforts, as well as horror-stricken by the statements which you have brought before the country. I know you do not wish for praise, and I therefore withhold it, but God's best blessing will rest with you in your arduous but glorious task. It is with real gratification I see in the papers the progress you made last night. I have no doubt but that the whole country must be with you; at all events, I can assure you that the Queen is, whom your statements have filled with the deepest sympathy.

'Believe me, with my best wishes for your *total* success,

'Ever yours truly,

'ALBERT.'

The bill passed the Lords without material injury, though their indifference and that of the leading bishops makes Lord Ashley repeat what indeed was a common sentiment with him: 'May God avert the day (of my coming amongst them) when my means of utility in public life would be for ever concluded!' But it brought little relief to himself; for we find him immediately afterwards taking his holiday, and preparing for the

<sup>1</sup> i. 427.

next conflict by a tour with Lady Ashley through the manufacturing districts, where, after a short visit to his much-attached Lady Frances Egerton at Worsley, he spends some time in Manchester

'perambulating the town on Saturday night in company with two inspectors, and passing through cellars, garrets, gin-palaces, beer-houses, brothels, gaming-houses, and every resort of vice and violence. These things cannot go on for ten years longer with a people increased by ten millions;' and 'then descending a coalpit 450 feet deep; thought it a duty; easier to talk after you have seen' (i. 435).

III. But the great battle of Lord Ashley's parliamentary life, one long remembered in Parliament, was at hand—the conflict with Sir R. Peel and Sir J. Graham on the 'ten hours' amendment to the Government Bill of 1844. He had by this time lived down all suspicion of unworthy or interested motives. Cobden had become, as we have seen, his admirer, if not his supporter, and if Mr. Bright, who had at that time attained no great parliamentary position, still attacked him bitterly, he was about to receive a severe lesson for doing so. It could no longer be called a party question, it was one of *Humanity* versus *Political Economy*, and Graham, who was rather famous at nick-names, described the Bill as 'Jack-Cade legislation,' just as he had described the sanitary reformer, Mr. Chadwick, as a 'Muck-worm.' There had, on the other hand, been a strong reaction in Lord Ashley's favour; Macaulay, who had hitherto been opposed to interference, supporting him warmly, and Lord John Russell and Charles Buller equally so. The conflict was itself one which drew out all Lord Ashley's peculiar gifts of description and heightened declamation. After indignantly repudiating the idea of attacking the manufacturing interest he had summed up thus:—

'If you think me wicked enough, do you think me fool enough for such a hateful policy? . . . No! we fear not the increase of your political power, nor envy you your stupendous riches. "Peace be within your walls, and plenteousness within your palaces." We ask but a slight relaxation of toil, a time to live and a time to die; a time for those comforts that sweeten life, and a time for those duties that adorn it; and, therefore, with a fervent prayer to Almighty God that it may please Him to turn the hearts of all who hear me, to thoughts of justice and of mercy, I now finally commit the issue to the judgment and humanity of Parliament' (ii. 27).

In answer to this appeal Graham at once rose, and declared that the Government would give the amendment their determined opposition. The debate, which lasted for several nights,

was  
one  
atta

which  
will  
and  
gent  
and  
purs

Mr.  
exp  
but  
that  
the  
were  
was  
says  
hood  
major  
and

T  
ducti  
Lord  
ment

'S  
and b  
other  
conso  
and s  
Engla

He v  
eulog

'I  
be, fo  
never

But b  
the ex  
empha

'I  
that I  
my vie  
ing wel



was throughout a most vehement one, and Mr. Bright made one of the last attacks on Lord Ashley's trustworthiness, an attack instantly met by Lord Ashley with the words,—

'I will thank the honourable gentleman to explain that charge which he has insinuated, and which he says he will not pursue. I will not allow it to pass. I therefore throw myself on the indulgence and on the protection of this House, and I do request all honourable gentlemen present to use their influence, as members of this House and as gentlemen, to make the honourable member for Durham pursue his charge and state his case' (ii. 28).

Mr. Bright eventually apologised, and 'withdrew any offensive expression.' Sir R. Peel followed in a very different strain, but he, too, concluded by an abrupt and emphatic declaration, that, 'I cannot, *and I will not*, acquiesce in the proposal of the noble Lord.' The result upon two successive divisions were majorities of *nine* and *eight* for Lord Ashley. The debate was delayed for a week to March 22, 'ministers quite mad,' says Lord Ashley, 'no reasoning, no misstatement, no falsehood almost, spared,' with the curious result at last of a majority of *three* against the ministers on the first division, and a majority of *seven* against Lord Ashley on the second.

The necessary result of all this confusion was the introduction of a new 'Factory Bill' by Sir J. Graham on May 3, Lord Ashley 'bating no jot of hope,' and moving his amendment in the closing words:—

'Sir, it may not be given to me to pass over this Jordan; other and better men have preceded me, and I entered into their labours; other and better men will follow me and enter into mine, but this consolation I shall ever continue to enjoy; that amidst much injustice and somewhat of calumny, we have at last lighted such a candle in England, as by God's blessing shall never be put out.'

He was followed by Graham, who, in words of generous eulogy, began by saying—

'I shall never be unjust to the noble Lord, whatever others may be, for I am satisfied that the cause which he has advocated could never fall into the hands of a better advocate.'

But both he and Sir Robert Peel, who followed him, staked the existence of the Ministry on their success, the latter in the emphatic words:—

'I know not what may be the result to night, but this I do know, that I shall with a safe conscience, if the result be unfavourable to my views, retire with perfect satisfaction into a private station, wishing well to the result of your legislation' (ii. 49).

There was, of course, no resisting such an appeal as this. In a House of nearly 440 there was a majority against Lord Ashley's amendment of 138.

We have given in some detail, for it has been hardly possible to abridge, this account of one of the most remarkable debates in every respect of the last generation, and one which perhaps was the most striking scene of Lord Ashley's public life. We may be allowed to add, as a not inappropriate conclusion, the characteristic reflections of Lord Ashley himself, and of a journal-writer, whom he would probably have described as the 'Mr. Worldly-wise-man' of his generation—Mr. Charles Greville.

May 12. Sunday. 'At last a day of repose. Have been in a whirl by night and by day, sleepless all day, or if sleeping, like a drunken man, all night; my head quite giddy, and my heart absolutely fainting; too much to do in quantity, in variety, and importance. Delivered at last, by God's especial mercy, on Friday night of my burden, not only *without failure*, as I felt at the time, but also *with honour*, as I learned afterwards. Oh! what trouble, time, and perplexity removed!' (ii. 48).

Now let us hear Mr. Greville:

'I never remember so much excitement as has been caused by Ashley's Ten Hours Bill, nor a more curious state of things, such intermingling of parties . . . so much zeal, asperity, and animosity; so many reproaches hurled backwards and forwards. . . . The Government have been abandoned by nearly half their supporters, and nothing can exceed their chagrin and soreness at being so forsaken. . . . Then John Russell voting for ten hours, against all he professed last year, has filled the world with amazement, and many of his own friends with indignation. The opposition were divided—Palmerston and Lord John one way, Baring and Labouchere the other. Melbourne is all against Ashley; all the political economists of course; Lord Spencer strong against him. Then Graham gave the greatest offence by calling it a Jack Cade legislation, and they flew on him like tigers. *Ashley made a speech as violent and factious as any of O'Connell's.* Some abused him for not going on and fighting again, but he knew well enough it would be of no use. The House had certainly put itself in an odd predicament, by its two votes directly opposed to each other. But Government will carry their Bill, and Ashley will be able to do nothing; but he will go on agitating session after session, and a philanthropic agitator is more dangerous than a repealer either of the Union or the Corn Laws. We are just now overrun with philanthropy, and God knows where it will stop or whither it will lead us.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria*, 1837-52, ii. 236.

This was no doubt the approved tone of society, which always treats men like Lord Ashley as benevolent imbeciles—till their victory is won. The remaining history of the question may be told shortly. Lord Ashley brought forward the Bill once more in 1846, two days before resigning and losing his seat on the Corn Law question—and the first parliament after the Corn Laws carried it by a majority of sixty-three. 'I lingered,' says Lord Ashley, 'in the lobby, had not spirit to enter the House; should have been nervously excited to reply, and grieved by inability to do so.' It was gallantly and brilliantly taken up by the Bishop of Oxford (Wilberforce) in the Lords, and became law. But the Act had been badly drawn, a small but powerful minority of the masters contrived to evade it, and the battle had to be fought once more. It is needless to describe the final contest in 1850, which was in many respects that of 1844 over again; and Mr. Morley's eulogy on this and other bills, mostly of Lord Ashley, may be safely accepted as just.

'They established,' he says, 'a complete, minute, and voluminous code for the protection of labour... dangerous machinery must be fenced, children and young persons must not clean it while in motion; their hours not only limited but fixed; continuous employment must not exceed a given number of hours;... children must go to school, and the employer must have a certificate to that effect; special provisions for bakehouses, for lace-making, for collieries, and other special callings;... and all this to be guarded by authorities whose business it is "to speed and post o'er land and ocean" in guardianship of every kind of labour, from that of the woman who plaits straw at her cottage door, to the miner who descends into the bowels of the earth, and the seaman who conveys the fruits of universal industry to and from the remotest parts of the globe.'<sup>1</sup>

The same has ever since been the view of the House of Commons and the country. Ten years later, in 1860, when the results of his legislation were fully known, Mr. Roebuck, who had been one of its fiercest opponents, had the generosity to come forward and say—he was speaking on the labour of children in bleach works—

'I once opposed Lord Ashley, now Lord Shaftesbury, in bills of this description. I listened to the statements then made, that if we took away the last half-hour of labour we should ruin the manufacturers of England. But Lord Ashley persevered. Parliament passed the Bill which he brought in. And I appeal to this House whether the manufacturers of England have suffered by this legislation' (ii. 204).

As soon as Mr. Roebuck had finished, Sir James Graham came to him, and, laying his hand on his shoulder, said, 'I am

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Cobden.*

glad you have read your recantation, and will read mine tomorrow;’ which he did in still more emphatic terms. Mr. Gladstone followed, but not till five years later, and Lord Ashley, who had often said of him bitterly, ‘Gladstone never supported me,’ adds drily, ‘he does not retract with the honesty of Roebuck and Graham’ (ii. 206). But the most striking of all testimonies was that of Mr. Cobden after the speech on the Mines and Factories Bill in 1842, which was perhaps Lord Ashley’s greatest effort. Cobden came over to him at its conclusion, and, sitting down on the bench beside him, wrung his hand heartily and said: ‘You know how opposed I have been to your views, but I don’t think I have ever been put into such a frame of mind in the whole course of my life, as I have been by your speech’ (i. 425).

We have felt it right to give a great, and what may possibly have appeared an excessive, prominence to Lord Ashley’s work in factory legislation, because, extending over nearly the whole of his life in the House of Commons, it was, and must always be, associated with his name, and because he always spoke of it himself as his chief political work. In the three next years he was not idle, and in 1849 worked indefatigably as President of the Board of Health, with his excellent colleagues, Dr. S. Smith and Mr. Chadwick, during the whole of the violent outbreak of the cholera. In 1851 his father died, and he was transferred, not without gloomy forebodings, as we have seen, to the House of Lords, where he was no doubt a real power for the last thirty-four years of his life, though his journal often expresses with grim humour his regret—which was avowed afterwards by Lord Salisbury—at being removed from the ‘centre of life’ in the House of Commons: ‘They applauded as much as their undemonstrative natures would allow.’ ‘I should be certain to pass the measure in the House of Commons, but I shall have great difficulties in the Lords.’ ‘I would as soon speak to a statue gallery.’ His first care, however, after his father’s death, was devoted to his own property at St. Giles, in Dorsetshire—‘The Saint,’ as he calls it—where he found everything in a neglected and deplorable condition, cottages filthy, close, indecent, unwholesome, stuffed ‘like figs in a drum,’ while the debts on the estate were so great that he exclaims bitterly, ‘But what can I do? The debts are endless . . . and I am not a young man. Every sixpence I expend, and spend I must on many things, *is borrowed!*’ (ii. 367). He did not hesitate, however, at the most sweeping reforms, though they would afterwards have involved him in great difficulties, if he had not been much helped by the wise

advice of Lord Palmerston. He had before this entered upon the large sphere of labour which, beginning with what were called his 'Ragged Schools,' was almost, if not quite, the first attempt to grapple with the vice and misery of London. That strange anomaly in English life, which strikes religious foreigners so forcibly, had struck him.

'The population of London,' wrote Lacordaire in 1852, 'which is so lively and vigorous as a whole, is in detail most piteous to behold. I never saw such rags, or more degraded physiognomies. The Englishman, who is so almost femininely beautiful in the upper classes, is horrible to behold in the poorer throng.'<sup>1</sup> 'That the poor should never cease out of the land,' wrote Lord Shaftesbury, 'we know. But the poor of London are very different from the poor of Scripture. God has ordained that there should be poor, but He has not ordained that in a Christian land there should be an overwhelming mass of foul, helpless poverty.'

The 'Common Lodging Houses Bill,' the 'Juvenile Offenders Bill,' 'Board of Health Bills,' the 'Chimney Sweepers Bill,' the numerous 'Emigration Bills,' the bill for improving the dwellings of the poor and for Model Lodging-houses, the labours among the costermongers, the long-continued efforts for lunacy amendment—these form but a very few of the results of this conviction. But the fact was that, during the whole of his life in London, Lord Shaftesbury usually spent several evenings in every week, not to speak of the labours of the day, in attendance at a public meeting, or some other work devoted to the objects of charity.

Let us take as a single sample his work at the Ragged Schools, which he may be said to have taken up *con amore* from his fondness for boys and children, of which we shall see some touching examples. The work of Ragged Schools was not the creation of Lord Ashley, but had been begun by two or three excellent shopkeepers in London, and it was not till 1843 that he was aware of their labours. Charles Dickens, a worker of a different kind, but whom Lord Ashley described on his death as having 'received a special retainer' from God 'against every kind of misery and oppression,' and who was then fresh from the experiences of 'Charlie Bates' and the 'Artful Dodger,' was then, and always continued to be, deeply interested in Ragged Schools; but he describes the earliest ones as 'painfully struggling for life under every disadvantage.'

'I found my first Ragged School,' he says, 'in an obscure place called West Street, Saffron Hill . . . ; it was held in a low-roofed

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Lacordaire*, by Mrs. Sydney Lear, p. 268.

den, in a sickening atmosphere, in the midst of taint, and dirt, and pestilence, with all the deadly sins let loose, howling and shrieking at the doors. Zeal did not supply the place of method and training. The teachers knew little of their office; the pupils, with an evil sharpness, found them out, got the better of them, derided them, made blasphemous answers to Scriptural questions, sang, fought, danced, robbed each other—seemed possessed by legions of devils. . . . The lights were blown out, the books strewn in the gutters, and the female scholars carried off triumphantly to their old wickedness. With no strength in it but its purpose, the school stood it all out, and made its way. 'Some two years since I found it quiet and orderly . . . numerously attended, and thoroughly established' (i. 484).

Such was the humble beginning; it was not till 1845 and 1846, especially in the latter year, that Lord Ashley, who at that time was out of Parliament, could give much time to the work; but he then organized an effective committee, being, curiously enough, associated with Messrs. Locke and Gent, names which had been combined with that of the first Lord Shaftesbury, 'Achitophel,' in Charles II.'s immense grant of land to him in South Carolina. He began his work with characteristic system and energy by visiting, in company with a medical man and one of the missionaries of the City Mission, many of the worst slums of London, with the especial object of discovering the state of their houses and of bringing himself into direct contact with every kind of misery and vice. One of the most extraordinary of his many experiences of this kind is the following. As he was anxious to see what was the natural development of his ragged urchins, for whom he was then, in 1848, preparing an emigration scheme, he requested a Mr. Jackson, a City missionary, who knew the London thieves then far better than the police, and had the *entrée* into most of their dens, to arrange a meeting at which he might address them. A round-robin from forty notorious burglars was soon sent him, and on July 27, 1848, he was introduced into a room filled by about four hundred of the fraternity, ranging from the swell mob in black coats and white neckcloths to the roughest savages. He himself describes the scene:—

'I was anxious to know what was the character of these thieves . . . some of whom were exceedingly well dressed; others, however, had no stockings, and some of them no shirts. I wanted to know the great departments of roguery; so the Missionary said, "His Lordship wants to know the particular character of the men here. You who live by burglary and the more serious crimes will go to the right, and the others to the left." About two hundred of the men at once rose and went to the right, as confessed burglars and living by the greatest crimes' (ii. 267).

After  
prac  
how  
stea  
pray  
felt  
Cou  
is v  
met  
pou  
the  
man  
will  
'at  
me.  
mur

the  
Hou  
chil  
thir  
by t  
into  
28,0  
as I  
part  
with  
the  
late  
narr  
over  
who  
year  
Rag  
tem  
prop  
year  
sam  
pens  
whic  
by I  
thou  
pop  
mer



After a certain amount of good advice, to relinquish old practices, &c., one of the party interposed the question, 'But how are we to live till our next meeting? We must either steal or die;' and when Mr. Jackson urged them in reply, 'to pray, as God could help them,' Lord Ashley confessed to have felt some sympathy when one of the party addressed the Court, and said, 'My Lord, and gentlemen of the jury, prayer is very good, but it won't fill an empty stomach,' which was met with a general 'Hear, hear.' Lord Ashley, however, propounded his plan for emigration—which, we are told, was in the end embraced by upwards of three hundred—and then one man came forward in the name of the rest, and asked, 'But will you ever come back to see us again?' 'Yes,' he replied, 'at any time, and in any place, whenever you shall send for me.' And, as he said when repeating the story, the low, deep murmur of gratitude was very 'touching' (ii. 268).

Three or four schemes were devised to meet these wants, the Ragged School, the Emigration, and the Common Lodging House. Lord Shaftesbury estimated the numbers of the children for whom the Ragged Schools were meant at about thirty thousand, and the need of some such education was shown by the startling fact that in 1847 62,000 persons were taken into custody of whom 22,000 could neither read nor write, and 28,000 had no trade, business, or calling whatever. The boys, as Lord Shaftesbury himself describes them, abounded in all parts of London, 'but Whitechapel and Spitalfields teemed with them like an ant's nest,' where they were found 'spanning the gutters with their legs, dabbling with earnestness in the latest heaps of nastiness, and squatting at the entrances of the narrow and foetid courts and alleys,' one good climber climbing over the rails into the Regent's Park, and sleeping through the whole of an inclement winter in the park roller. In about six years some ten thousand of these boys were brought into the Ragged Schools, and Lord Shaftesbury made frequent attempts in 1848-53 to supplement the training by emigration, proposing that 'the Government should agree to take every year a certain number of children, say 1,000, 500 boys and the same number of girls, and transplant them at the public expense to South Australia' (ii. 259). His efforts of this kind, which were the same as those now so energetically proposed by Lord Brabazon, were generally failures. Such emigration, though urged by every great social reformer, has seldom been popular in England.

It is impossible, as we have said, to give more than the merest outline of Lord Ashley's efforts; but before leaving

this part of our subject it may be well to give a final specimen of the intense earnestness which he threw into them. The following is an account of his failure in the House of Lords, in 1854, to carry a measure which he had long pressed, 'to better the condition of the Chimney-sweepers :—

'May 20.—For three days have suffered much from giddiness, and to-day suffer from grief. The Government in the House of Commons threw out the Chimney Sweepers Bill, and said not a word of sympathy for the wretched children, nor of desire to amend the law. . . . Fitzroy and Russell giving the Ministerial opposition.

'May 21.—Very sad and low about the loss of the Sweeps Bill ; the prolonged sufferings, the terrible degradation, the licensed tyranny, the helpless subjection, the enormous mass of cruelty and crime on the part of parents and employers are overwhelming. . . . Henceforward effort will be hopeless, nevertheless it must be made. The collar of the Garter might have choked me ; I have not, at least, this or any other Government favour against me as a set-off against their insolence and oppression. I must persevere, and by God's help so I will . . . however painful and revolting the labour, I see no Scripture reason for desisting ; and the issue of every toil is in the hands of the Almighty. . . . I thank God that Palmerston was no party to the act ; he came to vote for me' (iii. 474–80).

It took twenty years more to carry the Bill, which is said to have been mooted nearly one hundred years before. This was due in great part to the energetic action of the *Times*, for whose general and powerful support Lord Shaftesbury at the end of his life expressed his warmest gratitude.

'House very inattentive,' says Lord Shaftesbury. 'At last they listened, and, as far as their undemonstrative natures would allow, applauded. . . . Yet by His grace I have stirred the country. The *Times*—may the paper be blessed !—has assisted me gloriously.'

This Bill was not carried till 1874, but in that year Lord Shaftesbury was still in the full swing of his activity. No subject of social improvement escaped him, from the Milliners and Dressmakers Bill, in 1854, down to his last speech in aid of a new Society for the Protection of Children against Cruelty, in 1884, and the last entry in his Journal in 1885, only a month before his death—'Went to the Home Office to see Cross on those fearful revelations in *Pall Mall Gazette*.' We shall not attempt to exhaust the long string of his labours even during the last ten years of his life, when with broken spirits and strength, his dearest friends falling around him, he still never allowed himself to intermit his labours, repeatedly exclaiming, 'I must die in harness ; I am wearied with this endless work, but who is there to do it if I will not ?' and even at the last

writing, 'I cannot bear to leave the world with so much misery remaining in it.' His seventy-ninth year is a fair specimen of his work, when he carried through the House of Lords the Habitual Drunkards Bill, and roused the Peers by a speech recalling the old tones of the Factory Bills of 1844 on the 'labours of children and women in the mills and factories of India.' It was about this time that one of his speeches called forth an exclamation from Lord Salisbury that he had never heard a more powerful burst of oratory. Justice was indeed hardly done during his life to his great power as a speaker in both Houses, which he himself habitually depreciated. But we have heard Mr. W. E. Forster asserting that if he had devoted himself to politics he would undoubtedly have been prime minister, and no one who has ever listened to his firm and impassioned tones in the House of Lords would doubt that he combined with the utmost force of expression that essential requisite of the highest oratory—intense conviction. 'I could never have been a politician,' he used to say, 'for I can never speak except upon conviction.' This power of stirring the hearts of all to whom he spoke he never lost. Nor indeed were there wanting even in those last days of comparative gloom many gleams of sunshine, which showed that his earlier labours had not been fruitless. The scenes with the roughest of his associates, the costermongers, the presentation of the donkey placed in the 'chair,' with the old Earl returning thanks on its behalf with his arm around its neck; and the words, 'When I have passed away from this life, I desire to have no more said of me than that I have done my duty as the poor donkey has done his, with patience and resignation,' when, 'the donkey having vacated the chair, it was taken by Lord Shaftesbury;' this and other similar scenes, especially with children, are enough to show that Lord Shaftesbury had plenty of humour as well as of tenderness, though often of a somewhat grim description. We shall only allow ourselves to give the short note to 'Tiny,' the last of his youthful correspondents. 'Tiny' (or her secretary) had written to ask

'If you please, Lord Shaftesbury, I want to ask you if you will give a bed to our new home. . . . You will come, I hope, and see our new home. I am sure you will like it, for I do, and my sister is with me.'

To this Lord Shaftesbury answers (iii. 414)—

'February 11, 1876.

'My dear small Tiny,—I must thank you for your nice letter, and say that, God willing, I will certainly call and see your new home,

and you too, little woman. You ask me to give a bed to the new home. To be sure I will. I will give two if you wish it, and they shall be called "Tiny's petitions." May God ever be with you!

'Your affectionate friend,

'SHAFTESBURY.

The last few years of this great and long life were in harmony with the rest. We have indeed thus far dealt mainly with its outward history, if anything could be called outward in a character which so completely 'moved altogether when it moved at all.' Nor shall we, except very briefly, venture to intrude upon the details of his domestic life, singularly touching and beautiful as they are. Four of his children preceded him to the grave, all tenderly mourned, and the effect of the loss of the first, then a boy at Harrow, was such that we almost shrink from repeating his own words: he was then comparatively a young man. 'Nothing,' he says, 'has now its former flavour. Two objects are constantly by day and by night before my eyes. I see him dying, and I see his coffin at the bottom of his grave. The flesh, do what I will, predominates. Then come to my relief his dear and precious words that God's mercy sent for my consolation. The pain ceases, and then begins anew' (ii. 289). The death of Lady Shaftesbury, who had been in every way the brightness of his life, was felt, in his own words, as that of 'a wife, as good, as true, and as deeply beloved as God in His undeserved mercy ever gave to man.' But whatever were Lord Shaftesbury's mental troubles—and they were no doubt both intensified and relieved by his painfully susceptible temperament—they were always of that type which he who felt himself unworthy of the name of an Apostle has represented, as 'cast down, but not forsaken, as dying, and behold we live, as having nothing, and yet possessing all things.'

It will be seen that in all we have said we have desired to give no stinted admiration to the *Life and Work* of Lord Shaftesbury; indeed we are almost afraid that our account of it may be open to the remark that it is rather a eulogy than a review. We must endeavour therefore in common fairness, before we close, to consider his character in another aspect, and not to shrink from indicating some grave errors which appear to us to have often seriously affected his usefulness.

There is no doubt that Lord Shaftesbury's theological opinions and many of his actions were opposed to those which have guided most of the best men and the greatest thinkers in the Church of England during the past and the present generation. We have no wish to make too much of this

fact  
its  
Puse  
only  
shou  
celle  
diffe  
*Life*  
Dr. 2  
self  
saying  
the A  
called  
is cer  
his d  
name  
'The  
for C  
but, a  
their  
ness,  
(iii. 2)  
ment  
again  
'Rom  
my o  
once  
Even  
If the  
Lord  
would  
W  
often  
and no  
of Cec  
hero w  
such m  
he reg  
he imit  
fects.  
and of  
bined i  
the Se  
Catholi  
is what

fact: it would be a mistake to do so. In a Church which by its very constitution tolerates large differences of opinion, Dr. Pusey's wise saying that mutual toleration is our best and only possible course must be our principle of action; and it should be matter of rejoicing when we can recognize the excellence of many of those from whom we may most appear to differ. No letters are more touching in Lord Shaftesbury's *Life* than those of warm admiration which he received from Dr. Pusey and Cardinal Manning. He tells us however himself that he was an 'Evangelical of the Evangelicals,' and this saying is somewhat ostentatiously paraded by the writer of the *Life*, as if it implied an entire agreement with what are called at present 'Evangelical opinions.' Now, if one thing is certain, it is that Lord Shaftesbury constantly expressed his dissent from the ordinary 'Evangelical' of the day. 'The name,' he somewhere says, 'is a mere theological expression.' 'The Ritualists,' he adds elsewhere (iii. 383), 'have more zeal for Christ than the Evangelicals. There are noble exceptions, but, as a body, "this people honour Me with their lips, but their heart is far from me."' And his complaint of the coldness, bitterness, insincerity of the 'bulk of the Evangelicals' (iii. 254) was (as the writer of the *Life* assures us) 'not a sentiment written down in the heat of the moment, it is repeated again and again in his Diaries.' 'High Churchmen,' he says, 'Roman Catholics, even infidels, have been friendly to me; my only enemies have been the Evangelicals.' 'Who,' he once contemptuously adds, 'is to lead a regiment like that? Even Falstaff would not march through Coventry with them.' If the ordinary 'Low Church Evangelical' of the day claims Lord Shaftesbury for his leader, it is plain enough that he would not have returned the compliment.

What Lord Shaftesbury really was—and he takes care often enough to tell us so—was an Evangelical of the past and not of the present—an admirer of the first Henry Venn, of Cecil, of Henry Martyn, and of John Wesley—an especial hero with him—to whom he added in the last generation such men as the excellent Mr. Bickersteth of Watton. These he regarded as the great revivers of religion in their day, and he imitated them alike in their excellences and in their defects. A deep and constant sense of the presence of God and of our Lord, if we may speak so plainly, was combined in him with an intense belief, and a desire to 'hasten' the Second Coming of our Lord upon earth, and this no Catholic can otherwise than admire. What we do desiderate is what his teachers could not give him—any sense that our

Lord had come to found a Church as well as to teach a Gospel, and by consequence any desire to make his own Church answer to that high ideal. And this want was strangely fostered by what no one can fail to remark, his almost absolute ignorance of theological study and of the history of the Church. The absorbing occupations of his life, and an undoubted narrowness of view which meets us at every turn, will explain much; but we are astonished that a man of his power and literary tastes should have been able almost totally to ignore the strongest argument for the religion he loved so well—the history of the Christian Church. There is scarcely a vestige in his life of his having studied it, or read the works of any one of its great writers. If a Roman Catholic had asked him, 'Where was your religion before Luther?' he might almost have answered with his usual vehemence, 'Nowhere.'

His vehemence of mind and language encouraged no doubt this narrowness of his convictions. No one expects a theological Achilles, such as he was, to be given to mincing his words. And Lord Shaftesbury was, in fact, though he certainly did not know it, much more like a knight of the middle ages than a politician of the nineteenth century; his spirit was exactly that of St. Louis, who was fond of saying, according to Joinville, 'Never argue with an infidel, but thrust your sword up to the hilt into his bowels.' For the foundation of his genius was, after all, of the true poetic type, and Tennyson's lines upon Sir Galahad have been often in our mind in describing him:

'My good blade carves the casques of men,  
My tough lance thrusteth sure,  
My strength is as the strength of ten,  
Because my heart is pure.'

And if we add that he was

'Dowered with the hate of hate, the scorn of scorn,  
The love of love,'

we have nearly a complete picture of his intense, enthusiastic, sympathetic character, in which the natural pride of the aristocrat, though never completely overcome, was tempered by deep genuine humility, and which always expressed that feeling of 'thorough,' which long before had brought a great man of very different opinions to the scaffold. The pity was that Lord Shaftesbury never apparently had a religious friend who was on an equal footing with him, mentally and socially; and

tha  
of c  
ludi  
' loa  
renc  
app  
vom  
asse  
that  
soun  
ful, t  
Jupit  
wors  
it mu  
the w  
broug  
press  
will r  
(whic  
pared  
Roma  
asham  
and c  
prayer  
Gath-  
and d  
Himse  
His de  
we pie  
A  
influen  
appoint  
and wh  
Lord  
Ministe  
Mr. Ev  
'Palmer  
does not  
of Roma  
a short t  
of Pusey  
But  
Lord P  
Ecclesia  
VOL.



that, surrounded by an obsequious body of admirers, this habit of denunciation grew upon him in his later years to an almost ludicrous degree. He 'shudders' at Dean Stanley's theology, 'loathes Dr. Jowett's opinions,' 'views Colenso with abhorrence,' and finally pronounces *Ecce Homo*—in spite of the approbation of a bishop—to be 'the vilest book that was ever vomited forth from the jaws of hell.' Compared with this, his assertion that the House of Lords was not 'a reformatory, that it should receive a convicted criminal, like John Russell,' sounds temperate, and Ritualists and Puseyites may be thankful, the first that they are only declared to be worshippers of Jupiter and Juno, and the second that they have nothing worse than 'cells in Bedlam' prepared for them. Meanwhile, it must not be forgotten that these ebullitions did not express the whole, or the best, of Lord Shaftesbury. When he was brought in contact with it, which he seldom was, he can express the warmest admiration for a fine cathedral service; he will not listen to the idea that the Presbyterian worship (which he does not allow to be *worship* at all) is to be compared with our own; he will not even deny the power of the Roman Catholic Mass ('these people are at all events not ashamed of their religion'), and envies them their crowded and open churches; he naturally and tenderly longs for prayers for the dead, and—oh! tell it not in any Low-Church Gath—he actually appears to have carried with him a Crucifix, and declares that 'to bear about a memorial of what God Himself once exhibited to the world does but simply recall His death and passion, and forces us to look on Him whom we pierced' (i. 177).

A few words should be said, before we conclude, of the influence which Lord Shaftesbury exercised over Church appointments, of which he has himself given us an account, and which forms a curious chapter of ecclesiastical history. Lord Palmerston, his wife's father-in-law, becomes Prime Minister, and Lord Shaftesbury writes at once to his son, Mr. Evelyn Ashley, that

'Palmerston's ecclesiastical appointments will be detestable. He does not know in theology Moses from Sidney Smith. The Vicar of Romsey is the only clergyman he ever spoke to; and it was only a short time ago that he heard for the first time of the grand heresy of Puseyites and Tractarians' (ii. 505).

But a change soon comes over the spirit of his dream. Lord Palmerston virtually appoints him his Minister for Ecclesiastical Affairs, and for nearly ten years, from 1856 to

1866, almost every appointment passes through his hands, or rather through those of his narrowest advisers. That things did not turn out worse than they really did, he himself, if he had been in our position, would have attributed to 'nothing short of Divine interposition;' for many of his appointments, if they were not quite what Bishop Wilberforce often described them, 'wicked,' were of the narrowest possible type, and the Church, especially in the North, has hardly yet recovered from their influence. Certainly he cannot be said to have been quite satisfied with them himself, for there are no men whom he more frequently denounces than his own Bishops, who, he complains, deserted him on almost every philanthropic movement. He excepted once or twice Archbishop Tait, whom he had made Bishop of London—the one really statesmanlike prelate whom he had appointed—but who (at least in his later years) was too large and generous in his sympathies to be entirely trusted by him.

But enough! for it is no grateful task to express dissent from the acts or feelings of a noble character—though it may be necessary to remind ourselves that admiration, even for the best man, does not always imply agreement. It is far pleasanter to hope that in the foregoing pages we have endeavoured to describe, with some justice, the character of one to whom it was given to exhibit the highest type of self-devoted zeal, and to confer upon his country, perhaps more than any other man, the greatest social, and many of the greatest religious, benefits. 'The social reforms of the present century,' said the Duke of Argyll in a speech before Lord Shaftesbury's death, 'have been due mainly to the influence, character, and perseverance of one man—Lord Shaftesbury;' and the saying was repeated by Lord Salisbury, and had been expressed still more strongly by Mr. Disraeli. That such was the feeling of the whole country he cannot but have been sensible himself, even during his life, though his self-depreciation would hardly suffer him to acknowledge it; and it was far more shown at his death. At the Service at Westminster Abbey, which preceded his funeral at St. Giles—he had refused to be buried in the Abbey itself—every class of Englishman, from Royalty to the humblest labourer, may be said to have been present. Deputations from Homes and Refuges, and training-ships, from Missions and Charities of every kind, from his own Ragged Schools, Shoeblacks, Chimney-sweepers, and Costermongers, were ranged, each with their craped banner, emblazoned with the words, 'I was naked, and ye clothed Me,' or 'I was a stranger and ye took

18  
M  
fr  
ta  
of  
va  
No  
se  
in  
no  
ass  
suc  
trib  
to  
ran  
rev  
the

AR

A L

THE  
upon  
tent,  
nish  
ways  
as th  
year  
very  
Liber  
and  
by th  
posed  
woul  
her a  
chart  
book

Me in'—on each side of Parliament-street. Representatives from no less than one hundred and fifty religious and charitable institutions thronged the approaches and the interior of the Abbey, which has seldom united within its walls so vast and mixed a congregation of true and hearty mourners. No such sight—though in many respects differing—had been seen in England since the funeral of the Duke of Wellington in 1852; and it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that 'for no other man in England, or in the world, could a like assembly have gathered together.' But the highest glory of such a character is not to be found even in this solemn tribute. It is in the noble example which he has bequeathed to his order and his country, which will animate others of his rank and talents to the same great work, and which, exactly reversing the doom pronounced on his first great ancestor by the poet, will make the name of Shaftesbury

'A name to all succeeding ages *blest*.'

---

#### ART. VIII.—LORD SELBORNE'S DEFENCE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

*A Defence of the Church of England against Disestablishment.*  
By ROUNDELL, EARL OF SELBORNE. (London.)

THE series of attacks which in recent years have been made upon the Church of England have been determined, persistent, and well organized. The organization which has furnished the agents, provided the machinery, and supplied the ways and means for carrying on these attacks is that known as the Liberation Society. This Society was formed in the year 1844, under a name which it has since discarded for the very plausible and misleading title of 'The Society for the *Liberation* of Religion from State Patronage and Control,' and this liberation it professes can only be accomplished by the passing of an Act of Parliament embodying its proposed scheme for Disestablishment and Disendowment, which would so coercively control the Church as to take away from her all her buildings and endowments, deprive her of all her chartered rights and liberties, repeal all laws on the statute book in any way recognizing her existence, and in short would

abrogate and dissolve her as an ecclesiastical institution known to the law, leaving her to legally reorganize and reconstitute herself as best she could, without a single building of her own in which to worship God, or a single acre or shilling of her ancient or modern endowments. For under the Liberation scheme the modern churches and endowments provided by Churchmen at a cost of many millions of voluntary contributions would not, as some people imagine, be spared to the Church, but would revert to those builders and founders or to their heirs and successors, or be vested in the congregations then worshipping within the buildings. However this might be, one thing is certain, that the promoters of the Liberation scheme and the champions of the Radical programme do not intend to leave a single stick or stone or shilling in possession of the Church of England. Of that great historical ecclesiastical institution of the country which has always hitherto been recognized by the nation and protected by the law, they would call upon Parliament to make a clean sweep. And this, forsooth! is the liberation whereby the Liberation Society would liberate the Church from State patronage and control; that is to say, under the pretence of freeing the Church from State control it would, by the compulsory powers of an Act of Parliament passed for the purpose, literally *control* her out of existence as now ecclesiastically and legally constituted, and it would so far subject her property to State control as to take every atom of it from her. Verily this would be freeing the Church from State control with a vengeance! For even if such a mockery of liberationism could be carried out by depriving the Church of her rights, liberties, and property, absolute freedom from State control in matters of religion could never be realized by the newly organized and reconstituted Church, for in her altered relations with the State she would but have exchanged a form and machinery of operation of State control which was liberal and elastic, for one which when put in motion would prove more rigid, galling, and severe.<sup>1</sup>

The Liberation Society has worked away for more than forty years at the self-imposed task of trying to sap and mine the foundations of the Church, with a zeal, dogged determination, skill, and large expenditure of funds worthy of a better cause. In every city, town, and village in the kingdom it has been sedulously and with unwearying persistence sowing the tares among the wheat, creating prejudices against

<sup>1</sup> See the article on 'Dissenting Trust-deed Creeds and State Control,' in *C. Q. R.* for April 1885, p. 72.

the Church, and trying to poison and excite public opinion against her.

By exaggeration of abuses, misstatements of facts, and the propagation of multifarious misrepresentations and fallacies in the pulpit, on the platform, in the press, and by means of the circulation of cheap publications, tracts, and leaflets, a growingly formidable crusade has been carried on against the Church for many years past.

That Churchmen until comparatively recently treated with contempt or indifference all those virulent attacks upon the Church, and let the Liberationists and their allies have very much their own way, only emboldened the opponents of the Church the more to speak, and plan, and organize with a vaunted confidence that their long-cherished object of Disestablishment and Disendowment was nigh at hand, and that the embodiment of their scheme in an Act of Parliament was almost within the region of what has been called 'practical politics.'

But as it proved, the Liberation Society was too confident, its boastings were too loud, its proposals too audacious, and its bold and cunning political scheme for compassing its ends was productive of results which, to its surprise, recoiled with full force upon itself.

The fact is that the enfranchisement of the masses of the people, and the very large addition of some ten millions of voters to the lists of electors, led the Liberation Society to speak and act as if its day of victory had come. It thought within itself that these masses of the people were prejudiced against the Church, were opposed to the Church, and that they could readily be induced to vote against the Church, and if so, then Disestablishment and Disendowment were surely at last within measurable distance if not close at hand. Under this impression it organized a new propaganda machinery for the occasion, and set itself to the work of carrying its crusade into every parish in the kingdom, with the confident hope of educating the new electors in its views, and securing if possible their solid vote in favour of Disestablishment and Disendowment. To this end it went, through its agents and adherents, to its utmost length in making the most virulent attacks upon the Church, and in the unscrupulous employment of the most questionable weapons of distorted history, misrepresented facts, gross exaggerations of abuses, and the restatements of a hundred times corrected errors, to further its cause.

Moreover, it held up to the labourers and the poor the audacious picture of the Church and the clergy living in a

state of luxury and pampered ease on tithes which were the rightful and legal property of the poor, whom, they affirmed, the Church had robbed. It told them that by Disestablishment and Disendowment they would get back their alleged lost property. It held up to them alluring pictures of the immense monetary gains which, in a variety of ways, were to come to them.

The Liberation Society went further. Its growing assumptions knew no bounds. It took for granted that through its influence, and that of its allies, most, if not all, Liberal parliamentary candidates were at its mercy and disposal, and would be compelled to subscribe to its programme, and do its bidding, if they wished to have any chance of gaining or retaining a seat in Parliament. It acted accordingly. It put on a bold front, and assumed to be master of the political situation of the autumn of 1885. Unfurling its political banner of Disestablishment and Disendowment, it proceeded to apply its liberation test to hundreds of the parliamentary candidates. Some accepted it willingly; others, taken aback, were stunned, confused, and taken in the wily trap. Believing that the Liberation Society could really exercise the political power which with great swelling words it claimed to possess, they thought themselves unable to get into Parliament without its support, and so took the bait so adroitly held out to them, and swallowed the Liberation Society's programme, in some cases, it is said, with the understanding that their having done so was to be kept a secret.

But the Liberation Society overshot the mark, and blinded itself with the delusion that it was to have all election matters very much its own way. In this it was mistaken. It forgot that it had to reckon with the as yet undeveloped political power of the Church of England, before matters came to an issue. When the political and electioneering machinations and tactics of the Society were brought to light, the Church, which had hitherto been comparatively indifferent to the assaults of the Liberation Society, awoke to some sense of danger. She roused herself to action, and immediately began to put forth her strength in the protection of her threatened position. Her clergy and laity heartily co-operated in the work of Church defence—which Church defence really means nothing more than educating the people in the true history of the Church, explaining to them her origin, organization, and process of development, and the true voluntary character of her churches and endowments, as well as exposing and refuting the current misrepresentations and fallacies which are so maliciously and



industriously circulated concerning her. To this work many of the clergy and laity most heartily gave themselves with an earnestness and zeal worthy of the sacred cause in which they were engaged, and adequate to the crisis which had arisen in most of the constituencies. By sermons, lectures, meetings, and the abundant circulation of suitable literature, the Church's true case was put before the electors, and the case against her, as compiled, published, and misrepresented by the Liberation Society, was exposed and refuted. The electors were enlightened as to the history of the Church, and learned many important facts concerning her of which they had been hitherto ignorant. The candidates pledged to Disestablishment became frightened when they saw how public opinion was going, and were embarrassed and mortified when they found how they had been compromised by the easily and audaciously extorted pledges of the Liberation Society. The power of the Church made itself felt on all sides. Hastily given pledges of hostility to the Church were promptly renounced or explained away, but those who had been caught in the Liberation trap were prejudiced and damaged candidates, with little chance of success.

The Church's influence, exerted even to a very limited extent for the short space of a few weeks, counteracted the whole organized force and power of the Liberation Society put forth for years, aided as it was by the adherents of the Radical programme. Not only was the Church victorious in the crisis, but the very attack made upon her has been very largely subordinated to her good. The intended curse has been turned into a blessing, and has really benefited the Church in manifold ways. The attack upon the Church roused Churchmen from their apathy and indifference. It enlightened them as to the true nature of the designs of the Liberation Society against the great historical ecclesiastical inheritance which they have in the Church of their fathers. Hundreds of the clergy who had hitherto never given any particular attention to the history of the Church now began to read up and study the subject, and numbers of books, tracts, and leaflets, dealing with all aspects of the Church question are the result. Representatives of all classes of the laity have also been forward in the work, and have written in the press, and published numerous books and pamphlets upon the subject of the proposed Disestablishment and Disendowment. In fact, a new species of literature has been created upon the subject, and incidentally we may say that we owe this new literature, as the result of new enlightenment, and as the source of

yet further enlightenment in the future upon all Church questions, to the attacks of the Liberation Society, and to the researches and studies of Churchmen to provide facts and arguments for the work of Church defence.

Earl Selborne's latest contribution to this new Church defence literature is in all respects worthy of himself. The volume covers a large area of subjects and aspects of subjects, and leaves scarcely a single point untouched that appertains directly or indirectly to the complete statement of the case on behalf of the Church as setting forth her just claims to retain her historical position in the kingdom in full and undisturbed possession of her rights, liberties, and prosperity, and as a reply to the case alleged against the Church by her opponents, especially as stated in the Liberation Society's book called *The Case for Disestablishment*.

It would be difficult to imagine any book in which in so short a space are compressed more misstatements of facts, and in which more mischievous fallacies are embodied to the prejudice of the Church, than this book of the Liberation Society. As an armoury of misrepresentation from which weapons of alleged facts and sophistical arguments might be drawn and used against the Church, it may be said to have held the field; but since the publication of Lord Selborne's book, *The Case for Disestablishment* is put to open shame, refuted and discredited as it is, in all its details, by one of the most exemplary laymen of the Church of England, and one of the ablest lawyers and statesmen of our time.

One of the proverbs of Solomon (xviii. 17), 'He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him,' has found a striking exemplification in the Liberation Society's statement of its subtle and sophistical case against the Church of England, and in Lord Selborne's scathing exposure of the inaccuracies, or—not to be too mealy-mouthed—the downright falsehoods to which that *Case* resorts.

Lord Selborne deals with the Liberation Society's publication chapter by chapter, and section by section, making point by point against it with all the hard matter-of-fact and logical force of one of the ablest of counsel who has ever yet held a brief for the Church, while he sums up his arguments and states his decisions in favour of the Church and against the Liberation Society's case with all the dispassionate calmness of the judicial mind.

The introduction to Lord Selborne's book is cast in the

form  
thir  
stor  
his  
tude  
amb  
prop

ever  
early  
the  
cann  
ston  
and  
he t  
year  
cenc  
teriz  
is to  
whic  
hear  
whic  
curre  
his in

V  
caus  
sion  
pers  
whic  
or re  
thoug  
mean  
of Di  
of 'a  
is by  
fuse  
mean  
lips  
as the  
of he  
name  
there  
woul  
for M  
distin

form of a letter to Mr. Gladstone, and extends over some thirty-five pages. This letter is addressed, 'My dear Mr. Gladstone,' and is a powerful and awakening remonstrance with his old Cabinet colleague as to the uncertainty of his attitude, the doubtfulness of his views, and the mischievous ambiguities of his public utterances with reference to the proposals for Disestablishment and Disendowment.

The very first words of Lord Selborne's letter, 'To whatever extent you may retain or may have relinquished your early views of the proper relations between Church and State, the subject, I am persuaded, is one to which you are not and cannot be indifferent,' cannot have been read by Mr. Gladstone as the words of a faithful and tried political coadjutor and friend without vividly recalling to him the position which he took up towards the Church and State question in past years, which contrasts strangely indeed with the cautious reticence and uncertain and enigmatical utterances that characterize all his references to the subject in the present day. It is to the exposure of the dangerous meanings and impressions which may be conveyed to the public mind by these hollow, heartless, and evasive utterances of Mr. Gladstone—utterances which have now become historical and are constantly in current use—Lord Selborne devotes a considerable portion of his introductory letter.

We say that these phrases are hollow and heartless because they convey no solid definite meaning, and no expression of feeling as to what are really Mr. Gladstone's own personal convictions upon the great and burning question on which he chooses to assume an oracular position. The hearer or reader may put upon them what construction he pleases, though there is too much reason to believe that they are meant to encourage hopes and excite efforts in the direction of Disestablishment. Such utterances may indeed be worthy of 'an old parliamentary hand,' whose object, it would appear, is by his ambiguous language to obscure his subject and confuse and mystify the minds of his hearers or readers as to his meaning, but they are nothing short of disgraceful from the lips of the Mr. Gladstone whom we used to know in past years as the loyal son and advocate of the Church and the defender of her rights and liberties. But such is the glamour round the name of this once great statesman, that even now, we believe, there are thousands of Churchmen throughout the land who would be glad to rehabilitate their sadly-shaken respect for Mr. Gladstone if they could only hear his voice, in clear, distinct, and unmistakable language, declare his own personal

convictions and his intended line of policy upon the current questions of the desirability or undesirability of the proposed Disestablishment and Disendowment of the English Church. Nay, further, we venture to say that even if Mr. Gladstone's avowed opinions were in favour of Disestablishment and Disendowment, if it were evident that the tendency and current of his views were in that direction, and if he by suggestive hints and encouraging words to the opponents of the Church be telling them in effect that if they will but agitate and create public opinion, the thing which they desire must come, and that in due time, to use his own words, the 'current' of 'the civilized world,' which 'slowly sets in this direction,' will flow even to England, and will be admitted to prevail with 'the general consent of the nation;' even then it is better for the defenders of the Church that they should know the worst as to the attitude of Mr. Gladstone, than that they should be left in the fog of shuffling phrases and bamboozled with mystery of masked intentions. *Ἐν δὲ φάει καὶ ὄλεσσαν.*

Lord Selborne's book is divided into three parts. The *first* deals with 'The Church and its Establishment;' the *second* has to do with 'Church Endowments;' and the *third* effectually disposes of the Church's 'Adversaries and their Case.'

The contents of the first part are chiefly historical and legal, and are only controversial so far as they contain the necessary refutations of those prevalent errors pertaining to the Church which not only obscure the truth, but are persistently set forth and are unfortunately too often accepted as the truth itself.

In what may be called a complete and exhaustive treatise on the subjects with which it deals—such as is Lord Selborne's volume—the learned and distinguished author necessarily goes over much ground that has been by various writers traversed hundreds of times before, in showing that the Church is in no sense a creation of the State, that she was never a branch of the Church of Rome, that she always preserved her distinct nationality, and never merged her ecclesiastical organization in that of any other Church. For her own laws, liberties, rights, and jurisdictions, even in the darkest and most trying days of her history, she never ceased to contend; and by no formal deliberative act did she renounce her own prerogative of supreme ecclesiastical jurisdiction, or cede the right of appeal of any of her bishops, clergy, or laity to the See of Rome. From the earliest days of the founding of the English Church, all through the Anglo-Saxon and Norman periods, and up

till the  
existence  
Rome  
indeb  
organ  
indeb  
Church

For  
Refor  
feeling  
lish e  
ances  
and to  
too g  
strain  
præmu  
of En  
their i  
affairs,  
withou  
or tem

Mo  
of Nor  
Bishop  
tion of  
have ti  
frequen  
setting  
followe  
cumsta

The  
tinuity  
foundin  
periods  
as she  
languag  
the pre  
Englan  
but *thru*  
stitution  
cally on  
eventful

Our  
low Lor  
the 'Bis

till the time of the Reformation, intercommunion of course existed between the Church of England and the Church of Rome. It was natural that it should be so, as England was indebted to a great extent to Rome for the founding and organizing of her Church, just as the English colonies are indebted to the Church of England for the founding of their Churches.

From the days of Wilfred in A.D. 680, till before the Reformation, individual bishops, clergy, and laity at times, feeling themselves aggrieved with the decisions of the English ecclesiastical tribunals, have sought to carry their grievances and appeals to Rome, and Rome in her own interest, and to the increase of her wealth and power, has been only too glad to deal with them. But by prohibitions and restraints of appeals, and by the provisions and penalties of *præmunire*, Lord Selborne shows that the Church and realm of England from time to time asserted their right and their independence and competency to manage their own affairs, and finally to decide upon any disputed questions without the intrusive jurisdiction of any foreign ecclesiastical or temporal power.

Moreover, from the days of Theodore, and of Egfrid, King of Northumbria, from whose decision Wilfred appealed to the Bishop of Rome, up till the Reformation, the usurped jurisdiction of the Roman See over the affairs of the English Church have time after time been protested against, and have been frequently and defiantly disregarded, Theodore and Egfrid setting an example in this respect which has been nobly followed by other archbishops and kings of England as circumstances rendered necessary.

Then as to the unchanged identity and unbroken continuity of the English Church from the days of her first founding right down through the Anglo-Saxon and Norman periods, and on till, through, and after the Reformation, and as she now exists, Lord Selborne speaks in no uncertain language, and shows her to be the same English Church in the present day that she has ever been in all the years of England's history. The Church in fact came to us not *from* but *through* the Reformation, unchanged in her identity, constitution, order, government, and discipline by any ecclesiastically or nationally legislative act which was passed in that eventful period.

Our readers will deem it unnecessary that we should follow Lord Selborne in his treatment of the 'Royal Supremacy,' the 'Bishops in Parliament,' and the origin and history of our

present Book of Common Prayer. Suffice it to state that all these subjects are clearly, ably, and withal briefly dealt with, as might be expected from a writer such as Lord Selborne, who has given careful consideration to these questions, and whose legal experience and judicial habit of mind enable him in a simple, intelligible, and masterly way to convey accurate views of them to his readers.

In the second part, under the general heading of 'Church Endowments,' the different kinds of Church property in lands, churches, parsonage houses, and glebes, episcopal and capitular estates with endowments of tithes and money, are enumerated. The fallacies as to the Church's property being *national* or *public* property in any unrestricted sense or in any way apart from its application to a distinctly specified religious use for which it was given and to which it was sacredly devoted by its voluntary donors in all periods of the Church's history, are clearly exhibited and refuted. The voluntary origin of the building of cathedrals, churches, and parsonage houses with their endowments in lands, tithes, or money, as the case may have been, *not by the State*, but by the Church's own individual members in their capacity as such, according to their respective abilities, from the King on his throne to the humblest of his subjects who may have had power and will so to do—are facts which Lord Selborne conclusively establishes, and which on no trustworthy historic evidence can be denied.

As to the origin, laws, and history of tithes in general, tithes in the abstract, and tithes parochial, and the numerous errors which are current concerning them, especially the mischievous misrepresentations that a portion of the present parochial tithes legally belong to the poor, and that the poor are robbed of them by the clergy, Lord Selborne's statements and explanations, given in plain language and brief compass, place all these subjects in a clear light, and leave no room for misunderstanding, or for detection, in his treatment of them, of insufficient evidence or inconclusive reasoning.

In the second part will also be found a statement of the approximate estimated amount of the whole annual income of the Church, and an effective exposure of exaggerations as to its alleged enormous sum, on which exaggerations the Liberation Society and its adherents are fond of descanting in their agitation against the Church and in favour of Disestablishment and Disendowment. Here also will be found the history of the origin of Queen Anne's Bounty, showing that the money which constitutes the fund from which grants are made for the increase of the endowments of poor parishes

come  
the  
bisho

I  
siasti  
posab  
are m  
place  
any

Chur  
episc  
charg  
and

capit  
stood  
the a

in fur  
tricts

tells  
grant  
the r

100,0  
ment  
1,000

B  
grant  
ment

enorm  
mona  
now i

the h  
religi  
them

mona  
the fa  
canno

that t  
tithes  
taken

religi  
were  
estate

year;  
2,962  
State



April

comes neither from the Crown nor from the State, but from the first-fruits and tenths paid out of the pockets of the bishops and certain of the beneficed clergy.

In the same way the history of the founding of the Ecclesiastical Commission is explained; and the funds at the disposal of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, out of which grants are made to aid in the endowment of new parishes in populous places, are shown to be derived not from the Crown nor from any State sources or parliamentary grants, *but from the Church's own property*, that is, from the surplus funds of the episcopal and capitular estates after the payment of primary charges made upon them for the fixed incomes of the bishops and cathedral dignitaries, to which bodies these episcopal and capitular estates originally belonged. The much misunderstood subject of parliamentary grants to the Church in aid of the augmentation of the endowments of poor benefices, and in furtherance of church building in poor and populous districts, is also here set forth in its true light. Lord Selborne tells us that the total parliamentary grants were 1,100,000*l.*, granted for the augmentation of poor benefices through the medium of Queen Anne's Bounty Board, at the rate of 100,000*l.* a year from 1809 till 1820, and 1,500,000*l.* parliamentary grants made for the purposes of Church extension, 1,000,000*l.* being granted in 1818 and 500,000*l.* in 1824.

But we may remark that these comparatively small sums granted by the State to the Church in aid of church endowment and church building are as nothing compared with the enormous capital value and annual income of that vast monastic property in buildings, lands, and appropriated, but now impropriated or rather mal-appropriated, tithes, chiefly in the hands of laymen, tithes which Henry VIII. by hypocritical religious pleas and on false pretences, that he wished to apply them to better religious uses, took from the Church with the monastic estates at the Reformation. If we take into account the fact that the estimated total rental of the monastic lands cannot be less than about two millions sterling a year, and that the income of the impropriated, or rather mal-appropriated, tithes—that is, tithes which, as we have said, were originally taken from the churches of their parishes and for more general religious purposes were annexed to monastic houses, and which were taken possession of by Henry VIII. with the monastic estates and given to laymen—amounts to over 962,000*l.* a year; and if we multiply the result of the sums mentioned, 2,962,000*l.*, by the number of the years that by the act of the State the monastic estates with their annexed parochial tithes

have been alienated from the Church and in the hands of laymen, we shall have some idea of the enormous indebtedness of the State to the Church in money matters, and we shall see how small is the indebtedness of the Church to the State in the matter of the parliamentary grants referred to.

But Lord Selborne shows that though the opponents of the Church taunt her with having received the parliamentary grants which we have described, they have but little grounds for so doing, as it is indeed a startling fact that the total Crown, State, and parliamentary grants received by the Presbyterians and seceders or Dissenters in Ireland from 1690 till 1869, inclusive of commutation money under the Irish Church Disestablishment Act and the grants made to the Presbyterians, Baptists, and Independents in England and Wales from 1722 till 1852, make a total which exceeds in amount all the parliamentary grants which the Church has received. While Lord Selborne exposes the extravagant estimates of the aggregate income of the Church, from tithes, endowments, and pew rents, and shows them to be grossly exaggerated, he himself gives its approximately accurate amount as taken from the *Clergy List* at 4,457,788*l.* per annum. This sum, he shows, if divided amongst the 13,824 incumbents of parishes, would give to each an income of less than 330*l.* a year; and if equally apportioned between the 13,824 incumbents and the 5,795 assistant curates, would afford to each a stipend of less than 228*l.* a year. But it must be borne in mind that this is the gross amount, from which there are to be made many deductions, especially in the case of tithes, every pound of which is subject, not only to the Queen's taxes, but also to all kinds of parochial rates, costs of collection, and losses from defaulters, before the *net* balance reaches the incumbent's pocket.

It will be admitted that the total amount of the Church's income, whether calculated as affording 330*l.* a year for incumbents or 228*l.* a year for both incumbents and assistant curates, is far from being a sufficient provision for their wants, considering the position which they have to maintain and what is expected of them; and viewed even in the light of a pecuniary compensation, it is out of all proportion in its adequacy to the work done and compared with the average incomes of other professions. It would, however, be a great mistake to represent the estimated annual income of the clergy, which we have named as 4,457,788*l.* from tithes, endowments, and pew rents, as the total income of the Church for general purposes, or to infer from it that Churchmen were relying upon this legally secured provision for their clergy as excusing

the  
C  
her  
gen  
par  
ere  
eva  
the  
the  
use  
vol  
Eng  
stat  
and  
am  
thre  
till  
stor  
actu

know  
the  
but  
cons  
In t  
Adv  
with  
selve  
own  
State  
gran  
aggre  
ceive  
patro  
passe  
chap  
rates  
purel

T  
and  
Selbo  
There  
which  
Gene

them from voluntary efforts and contributions to maintain the Church's organizations, carry on her works, rebuild and restore her cathedrals and ancient parish churches, and promote the general work of Church extension in the creation and endowing of new bishoprics, providing new cathedrals, forming new parishes, building and endowing new parish churches, and in erecting and providing mission chapels and mission rooms as evangelistic centres for missionary efforts, the better to reach the masses of the people and to win them to the Gospel and the Church. For on the authority of that most excellent and useful annual compilation of the organizations, institutions, voluntary income, expenditure, and work of the Church of England, *The Official Year-Book* for 1887, we are enabled to state that the voluntary contributions of Churchmen for these and other objects, so far as they have been ascertained, amounted to over eighty-one millions five hundred and seventy-three thousand pounds within the twenty-five years from 1860 till 1884, while their voluntary contributions for church restoration, church building, and endowment in 1884 alone actually amounted to 1,455,839*l*.

But Lord Selborne is not only the perfect master of all knowledge which is necessary to the complete statement of the direct historical, legal, and financial case for the Church, but he shows himself to be equally familiar with the whole constitution and outer and inner life of the Dissenting bodies. In the third part of his book, under the heading of 'The Adversaries and their Case,' he completely turns the guns with which political Dissenters assault the Church upon themselves, and uses them with destructive force against their own vaunted position of freedom from State patronage and State control in matters of religion. As to parliamentary grants, Lord Selborne, as we have stated, shows that in the aggregate Presbyterians and Dissenters have actually received more than the Church, while, with respect to State patronage, they have had a number of Acts of Parliament passed in their favour facilitating their acquisition of sites for chapels, &c., exempting their chapels from the payment of rates and taxes, and in other respects conferring upon them purely State-created rights and privileges.

Then with reference to the subjection of Dissenting bodies and their chapels and endowments to State control, Lord Selborne proves that this subjection is very real indeed. There is first the *external* State control over their chapels, by which they are by law required to certify them to the Registrar-General as places for public worship as a condition of their

ministers and congregations receiving the protection of law from interruption and disturbance in the conduct of their religious services, but in return for such protection no meetings for religious worship &c. can be held in them with bolted or barred doors under a penalty of forty shillings. Then as to marriages, they cannot be solemnized in Dissenting chapels until by requisition of certain householders and the application of the chapel authorities the chapels, after approval by the Registrar-General, are placed for that purpose on the Dissenting Chapel Marriage Register List, which is deposited at Somerset House, and no marriages can be solemnized in these chapels even when so registered for the purpose except by the authority of and in strict conformity with the requirements of the State, it being a condition to a valid marriage that the superintendent registrar of the district shall be present as the representative of the State. And although it is now proposed by a Bill at present before Parliament to relieve Dissenting ministers from the presence of the State officer at marriages in their chapels, yet even if that Bill should pass, the effect of its proposed provisions will be to make the Dissenting minister more the State officer than he was before, and in lieu of certain privileges conceded to him it will bring him more specifically and effectually under the control of the State. In the same way it may be pointed out that the whole tendency and effect of the Burials Acts, and of the various Burials Acts Amendment Acts have been to take rights, privileges, and responsibilities away from the clergy and to share them with Dissenting ministers. By these Acts Dissenting ministers are privileged, by these Acts they have imposed upon them legal duties and responsibilities, and by these Acts they are undoubtedly State-controlled.

Further, Lord Selborne most convincingly proves that not only are Dissenters subject to the control of the State in *external* matters pertaining to their chapels, endowments, and the conduct of their public worship, as well, we may add, as in the marriage and burial services performed by their ministers, but they are also absolutely under the ultimate control of the State with reference to their most spiritual *internal* affairs, so much so in fact that the final decisions in all questions of dispute which may arise in their communities as to matters of faith, of Church order and discipline, or any other points which may be set forth in their trust deeds, concerning which there may be serious difference of opinion amongst the members of their communities, can only be given by the State Courts, from the control of which in matters of

religion Dissenters have so often boasted that they were absolutely free!

But the long-cherished and vaunted idea that the doctrines, rules, regulations, and acts of discipline of Dissenting bodies are outside the area of the cognizance of the State, and are beyond the region of State control, has received a rude shock in recent years.<sup>1</sup> Religious bodies are beginning to find out, if they have not already made the discovery, that Royal Supremacy is not a power exercised only over the Church, but that all religious bodies are subject to it as well.

In the words of Lord Selborne:—

‘To the general Supremacy of the Crown, Nonconformists are as much subject as Churchmen. Neither as to the Church nor as to Dissenters is that Supremacy hierarchical or one of personal government by the reigning Sovereign; it is the Supremacy of law represented by the Sovereign or head of the State “over all persons and in all causes” within the realm. It is exercised as to matters concerning the Church of England in the manner prescribed in the laws relating to the Church.

‘As to other religious bodies it is exercised according to such Statutes as may be in force affecting them, and in other cases according to the general laws of the land. The difference is not that Nonconformists are exempt from State authority and control either as to the terms of their denominational union and connection, or as to the voluntary tribunals by which they enforce those terms upon their ministers and members; but that, whenever the authority and control of the State comes in, it does so under the ordinary forms and in the ordinary manner of civil justice, and not through courts specially constituted for the purpose. . . . The doctrine, as well as the discipline, of voluntary religious bodies may be, and from time to time has been, brought within the cognizance of the Civil Courts just as that of the Church of England is within the cognizance of the Ecclesiastical Courts. And it is material to observe that in both cases the Courts proceed upon the same principles’ (pp. 198, 199).

But there is another kind of very serious State control to which Dissenters are subject, and to which we desire to call attention, and that is their complete inability in any way to alter or modify their doctrines or rules of government, when once they are embodied in their trust deeds, without the authority of an Act of Parliament. That is to say, Dissenters are free in the first instance to set forth what they like in their trust deeds

<sup>1</sup> For a list of twenty-three Dissenting cases tried in the State Court of Chancery involving various questions of doctrine, discipline, and qualifications and dismissal of ministers, see *Nonconformist Endowments*, by the Right Hon. George Cubitt, M.P., Appendix C.

as to the doctrines to be received by their members, and to be held and preached by their ministers, but when they have done this they have so far in this matter parted with their religious freedom for ever. If for any reason they subsequently see cause to modify their theological opinions, and alter their trust-deed creeds, on the condition of conformity to which they hold possession of their chapels, they can no more legally do so than can the Church of England alter the Book of Common Prayer without the enabling power of an Act of Parliament. So that, look at the subject in what aspect we may, and from what standpoint we please, State control, though not exercised exactly in the same way, is as complete over the Dissenting chapel and its trust-deed creed, and its members and minister worshipping therein, as it is over any ancient parish church, its congregation, and its incumbent.

But it is evident to any one who has studied the proposals of the case for Disestablishment and the Radical programme, that with whatever primary aims the Liberation Society originally set out to the work of separating Church and State, and of attempting to free the Church from State control, those objects are its leading aims no longer. It may, indeed, once have had sincerely for its object the cherished aim of liberating the Church from State patronage and control, and with whatever mistaken notions may have desired by its action to increase the efficiency and influence of the Church in doing her work for God and for the people. But can anybody believe that this is any part of its aim now? Does the Liberation Society tell its infidel and atheistic allies that it is for these objects it seeks their help, and is willing to enter into confederacy with them in trying to effect the work of Disestablishment and Disendowment? Does anybody believe that its non-religious and anti-religious adherents would for a single moment follow its lead and help forward its work with such an object in view? No. Previously to and at the election of 1885, when the Church question was by the tactics of the Liberation Society thrust to the front, it boldly pulled down its flag for the liberation of the Church, and ran up its flag for the wholesale and complete confiscation of her property. With the cry of Church spoliation it appealed to the electors and sought to win their votes. It was with promised future bribes in land and gold, which were to be theirs at the expense of a disestablished and disendowed Church, that it sought to seduce the working classes from their loyalty to the Church of their fathers, and tried to enlist them in the army of her opponents. But it failed, and signally failed, as it



always will do if Churchmen will only be faithful to their Church, their sacred trust inheritance, and their duty in defending both.

But let Liberationist Dissenters beware of the consequences to themselves of raising and persisting in the clamorous cry for the Disendowment of the Church and the confiscation and alienation of her property to secular uses. Let them be warned that in doing so they are playing with a double-edged sword, which if once wielded against the Church, can with equal force be wielded against themselves.

For there is not an argument used to show that the property of the Church is 'public' property or 'national' property, but may be equally applied to all Dissenting chapels which are held and possessed under a trust, with their endowments. We know it is sometimes plausibly pleaded that such Dissenting chapels and their appendant endowments are 'private' property or 'private trust' property, but the fact is that they are neither. They are not so by the very nature of their trusts. They are not regarded nor treated as such by Dissenters themselves. The property of every Dissenting chapel held in trust is just like the property of the Church of England, that is, property in the nature of public property held in trust for limited and defined religious uses.

It is on this ground that the State exempts chapel property from rates and taxes, and confers upon it other civil privileges. Where is the private real property or the private trust property that is exempt from the payment of rates and taxes, or that has exceptional privileges conferred upon it?

We know the fallacious argument is often used by Liberationists as a plea for the justice and equity of the Disendowment of the Church, that if the pecuniary interests of the existing bishops and clergy were respected, nobody's pecuniary interests would be injured, forasmuch as the property of the Church is not the absolute property of any person whatsoever, and that no one has absolute or unconditional ownership in it.

But then we maintain that if the bishops and clergy in the event of Disendowment were ever so amply compensated the grossest injustice would be done to the great body of the laity, for whom churches and endowments, and bishops and clergy exist, and from whom it is proposed to take away this religious provision without giving them any compensation whatsoever.

We are also constantly hearing such arguments as these. The ancient and indeed most modern churches and endowments of the Church of England are not the property of the

ministers and congregations who use them. They have no absolute property in them, they did not inherit them, they did not build nor create them, nor did they in any way legally acquire absolute possession of them. Who, then, would be injured if the State took these churches and endowments from the ministers and congregations of the Church of England? But the effect of this kind of argument will easily be seen by using it in the case of a Dissenting chapel. Take Dr. Parker's City Temple for an instance—we trust it will be understood not in any personal or offensive sense, but simply because it is probably the best known of all London Dissenting chapels. *Whose*, then, is Dr. Parker's City Temple or Chapel? It is commonly called 'Dr. Parker's,' but it is not Dr. Parker's in any sense of absolute ownership. It is not his by inheritance. It is not his by purchase, or any kind of proprietary acquisition. It is not his by grant, or deed of gift. It is not his by life tenure, nor for any stated period. Dr. Parker could not of himself, nor by his own power, nor with the consent of the members of his community, deacons, and trustees, sell the City Temple, exchange it, or turn it to any use alien to that specified in its trust deed, without the sanction of the State. Dr. Parker is not absolutely and necessarily even a life tenant of his chapel. His legal use of it for his ministrations, and his emoluments derived from his ministering within its walls, both are dependent upon three things: 1st, the will of the members of his community expressed by their votes; 2nd, his preaching the doctrines of his trust deed, if any doctrines be prescribed in that document, whatever they may be—not excepting the crudest formulas of the most repulsive ideas of Calvinism; and 3rd, his absolute conformity to whatever else may be specified in the deed.

In much the same way, and for much the same reasons, the City Temple does not belong in any absolute proprietary sense to the members of the community worshipping therein, of whom Dr. Parker is the pastor. They have had no natural inheritance in, or succession to, the property, and they have no, strictly speaking, proprietary right in, nor absolutely disposing power over, the property. They, as a body, are as incompetent to exercise any absolute proprietary rights in or over the City Temple, as is Dr. Parker himself as their pastor. The same may be said of the deacons. They are but executors and administrators of the wishes of the community out of which they are chosen, acting within the limits of the powers with which the community of the City Temple is invested by virtue of the trust deed. And though there is a popular and wide-

spread opinion that trustees as such have some magic and elastic discretionary power over and above those specified in the deed, the opinion is without any foundation in law or fact; and so the trustees of Dr. Parker's City Temple have no more proprietary rights in, nor powers over, the City Temple, than Dr. Parker, his community, and his deacons.

*Whose*, then, we repeat, is Dr. Parker's Temple? This, indeed, is an interesting question, and the answer may possibly very much surprise some people. It is nobody's absolute property. It is property in which nobody can acquire any, even temporary or current, interest, except on professedly religious grounds; namely, by a profession of belief in accordance with the doctrines and principles of the trust deed, and by a distinctly avowed or implied conformity with the practices enjoined in the deed. When conformity to the doctrines and practices set forth in the deed ceases, all legal right and interest in the property are at an end.

If we mistake not, and we stand liable to correction, the City Temple was built with the funds which were the proceeds of the sale of the old Poultry Chapel, Cheapside. That chapel was sold under the authority of the State officers, the Charity Commissioners, on March 21, 1872. Now, as there is no person living who contributed to the building of the original Poultry Chapel, and as the present City Temple is built out of the proceeds of it, and as, moreover, neither Dr. Parker, his members, nor his deacons, nor trustees have any absolute rights of property in the Temple, and as they have not even a life interest in it, who would be injured if, Dr. Parker's pecuniary interests in it being equitably compensated, it were by the State taken away from Dr. Parker and his congregation and devoted to alien and secular uses?

If the State were induced to claim possession of either the ancient or modern property, or both, of the Church of England, for the purpose of applying it to secular uses, as Parliament might please, for the advantage of the nation, there is no differentiating principle of the nature of property, or exceptional privilege, or justice, or equity, which could be logically or consistently pleaded as against dealing with all Dissenting property precisely in the same way.

The power of the State as such, apart from the questions of justice and equity, is undoubtedly equally absolute over both. If the State has power over Church property, it has power over chapel property as well. If it exercises that power over one, it is bound, sooner or later, to exercise it over the other.

There can be no limit to the principle, once admitted in legislation, that the State may and ought to take the property of the Church, given to the Church as sacredly devoted to religious uses, and apply it to secular purposes. The principle must extend to chapel property. What is fair to the Church is fair to the chapel. What is good for the Church is good for the chapel. What Liberationists urge as fair and just and equitable on the part of the State in dealing with and reappropriating Church property, Churchmen, in turn, may reciprocate by urging the State—if indeed a growingly godless State felt any need of urging—to deal with chapel property on the same lines and in the same manner.

It may be safely predicted, therefore, that when the Church, as a propertied institution, falls to the ground, many another propertied religious and charitable institution will fall with it, or soon after it.

Once the oldest title to property in the kingdom is broken, and the ancient property, held under it for sacred uses, is laid hold of by hands not the less spoliating because authorized by an Act of Parliament, depend upon it no other trust property, for religious or charitable uses, will be safe, and the security and stability of the title and tenure of all property will have received a shock from the effects of which they will never recover.

We have now dealt with Lord Selborne's volume and subjects arising out of it as far as our space will allow. Here we must stop, and refer our readers to the volume itself for a complete view of the case for the defence of the Church, and also for a detailed and an exhaustive refutation of the Liberation Society's *Case for Disestablishment*. Lord Selborne's book ought to be deliberately read, thoroughly studied, and completely mastered by every Churchman who feels interested in qualifying himself for taking his intelligent part in the defence of the Church as against the attacks which are now being made upon her, and which in the near future will be made upon her with increased determination, persistence, and virulence. The book should not only be in the library of every clergyman and leading layman as a book of reference, but it would be an immense advantage to the Church if such a book could always be found at the elbows of many editors of newspapers, especially of the provincial press, some of whom are easily entrapped by plausible Liberationist fallacies, and fall into serious errors respecting the Church in the Disestablishment controversy purely from sheer ignorance of ecclesiastical history, facts, and laws.

ART. IX.—PRAYER-BOOK ENRICHMENT  
IN AMERICA.

## THIRD NOTICE.

1. *The Book Annexed.* As amended by the General Convention of 1883. Authorized Edition. James Pott & Co. (New York, April 1885.)
2. *Proposed Changes in the Prayer-Book.* Official Copy, printed for the General Convention of 1886.
3. *The American Church Review.* (Various numbers.)
4. *The Book Annexed. Its Critics and its Prospects.* By Rev. W. R. HUNTINGTON, D.D. (New York, 1886.)
5. *Reports of Diocesan Committees.*
6. *The Book Annexed and the Bishops.* By the Very Rev. C. R. HALE, Dean of Davenport, Iowa. (1886.)
7. *Prayer-Book Revision.* By the Rev. Dr. RICHEY.
8. *The Method of Liturgical Revision.* By the Rev. W. J. GOLD, S.T.D.
9. *The Living Church.* (Chicago, Special Daily Report of the General Convention.)

THE progress of the movement within the American Church towards the 'enrichment' of its Prayer-Book has all along been watched with a very genuine interest among ourselves. In two previous articles,<sup>1</sup> we examined in detail the various proposed alterations and additions, as they were conveniently presented in *The Book Annexed to the Report of the Joint Committee*, which was first appointed to consider the question by the General Triennial Convention of 1880. And we may perhaps venture to refer, with pardonable satisfaction, to the kindly and even complimentary language in which our criticisms have been acknowledged by Church writers on the subject in America.

It will now be useful to present to English readers, as accurately as it is possible for us at this distance to do so, what has taken place since with reference to this highly important movement, which will certainly not be without its reflex and sympathetic influence among ourselves.

*The Book Annexed*, as we reviewed it, was published at Philadelphia in 1883, as a schedule of the Report which the Joint

<sup>1</sup> C. Q. R. for April and July, 1884.

Committee presented to the General Convention of that year. The constitution of the American Church declares that 'no alteration or addition shall be made in the Book of Common Prayer or other offices of the Church . . . unless the same shall be proposed in one General Convention, and by a resolve thereof made known to the Convention of every diocese, and adopted at the subsequent General Convention.' But it appears that, happily or unhappily, the official notification of the proposed changes did not reach the dioceses until after the long delay of seventeen months after the General Convention of 1883; in fact, not until April 1885, and so not in time for their consideration by the Diocesan Conventions of 1885. This of course defeated the intention of the Constitution that the Church should have an opportunity of three full years' deliberation on such proposed changes. Dean Hale's pamphlet, *The Book Annexed and the Bishops*, exhibits bishop after bishop complaining in his 'Convention Address' of this prolonged delay, and of their being 'so near the meeting of the [General] Convention, which might make these important changes in public worship, with so little well-formed opinion of their expediency.' In point of fact, what may be called the second edition of *The Book Annexed*—i.e. its reprint 'as modified by the action of the General Convention of MDCCCLXXXIII.'—was not issued until April 1885. The time was all too short, as the event proved, for the dioceses and the Church at large to give that full and deliberate attention to the proposals of the Joint Committee which could alone justify any decisive action upon them by the General Convention which was to meet in October 1886. Nevertheless, the Diocesan Conventions, or some of them, did what they could in the brief interval allowed; and a convenient summary of the results arrived at in this partial examination is presented in Dean Hale's pamphlet, in which he gives a series of Episcopal utterances in support of his statement that 'the bishops who have expressed themselves publicly as to *The Book Annexed* have spoken almost with one voice.' That voice is, on the whole, adverse; or, at least, very decidedly in favour of delay and much more mature deliberation. He mentions only the Bishop of Michigan as 'on the whole favourably disposed towards *The Book Annexed* amended;' but quotes him as saying—in evidence of 'an opposition which has sprung up since the book has been in the hands of Churchmen for careful study and quiet thought'—that there has been 'a great change of opinion on the subject. Many who, one year ago, were supposed to be



heartily in favour of the general movement represented by *The Book Annexed*, have been found to be, if not actually and actively opposed to it, at least of doubtful mind in regard to it.' And the Bishop of Western New York, himself one of the most important members of the Committee on the Prayer-Book, expressed himself, in his Convention Address of 1885, as sure that 'sober second thought' had induced nearly everybody to refer the whole matter to a choice 'Commission, for new and patient revision, and a final report [to the General Convention] in 1889;' a course which is also recommended by the Bishop of Vermont in his Convention Address of 1886.

The Bishops of Western New York and Iowa seem also in favour of submitting the suggested changes to the test of some period of permissive actual use, before this final and definite adoption.

'Gather,' says the former, 'all that is good in the way of additions out of the "Annex" into a "Prymer." Enlarge the Prymer by selections from the richest liturgical sources of the whole Church, and make rubrical provision for their occasional and exceptional use, under Episcopal licence, but not for any disuse of the Prayer-Book.'<sup>1</sup> Let this, says the latter, 'be the work of a committee acting 'in concert with similar committees appointed by the Convocations of the mother Church.'

This last seems a good suggestion. Such joint action, which is also recommended by Dr. Richey in his paper on *Prayer-Book Revision in England and America*, though it might—

<sup>1</sup> An approach towards something of this kind is made in a work which has reached us, entitled, *A Book of Offices and Prayers set forth by the General Convention of 1886, and authorized for use on occasions for which no provision is made in the Book of Common Prayer, 1886*, p. 35. This has no printer's or publisher's name upon it, and is marked 'Unofficial' on the cover. It contains, in Division I., four Offices, viz.: 'A Penitential Office for any day in Lent;' 'An Office for Harvest Home;' 'The Beatitudes of the Gospel;' and 'A short Office of Prayer for Sundry Occasions;' and, in Division II., 'Prayers and Thanksgivings,' taken from those which follow the Litany in *The Book Annexed*. These are arranged under the heads of 'Morning and Evening;' 'Intercessory;' 'Thanksgivings;' 'Prayers for divers Blessings;' and 'Missionary Prayers,' of which seven are given. The Intercessory Collects are: For those who labour in the Gospel; For persons preparing for Confirmation; In the Vacancy of a Cure of Souls; For those who err from the Faith; For those who live in Sin; For the Increase of the Ministry; For Persons on a Journey; For Persons in Bereavement; and a General Intercession. The 'Prayers for divers Blessings' are: For the Spirit of Prayer; For Patience under Suffering; For the Light of God's Truth; For Wisdom; For Grace to speak the Truth in Love; For Grace to follow the Good Examples of God's Faithful Servants; After a Death; After the Death of a Child; and three new Collects, for Christmas, Easter, and the Transfiguration.

perhaps most beneficially—delay the ultimate result, would operate to the advantage of the Prayer-Book of the future, which it is certainly desirable should be, as nearly as may be, identical in the two great divisions of the now world-wide Anglican Communion.

Besides the above-mentioned summary accounts, the full 'Reports' of some of the Diocesan Committees on the proposed changes in the Prayer-Book have reached us. They give ample evidence of a very earnest and encouraging interest in the whole question, and of a very careful and detailed study of the alterations proposed. Perhaps the most valuable among the Reports which have been forwarded to us is that of the Diocese of Wisconsin, which, in twenty-four closely printed pages, goes fully into the principles and history of liturgical forms in the Catholic Church, and their bearing on the question now before the Church of America. This is really a document of permanent value, and would be welcomed by any liturgical scholar. We observe its first signatory is 'W. J. Gold, Chairman,' and perhaps we shall not err in assigning the chief responsibility for it to the author of the helpful pamphlet on *The Method of Liturgical Revision*.

In April 1885 the New York publishers, James Pott & Co., issued, 'by authority of the General Convention' (i.e. of 1883), *The Book Annexed* in an amended form, i.e. as 'modified by the action of the General Convention of 1883'; accompanying it with a companion or 'guide' to the proposed amendments which had been carefully prepared by the Rev. Dr. Anstie, the assistant secretary, and revised by the chairman and other members of the Joint Committee. In this form the proposed changes were clearly and fully presented as they were to come before the General Convention of 1886, after previous examination, had the time allowed only been sufficient, by the Church at large, and its several Diocesan Conventions and their committees. Further than this, a year later—in April 1886, some six months before the meeting of the General Convention—the 'alterations and additions proposed in the General Convention of 1883, and to be acted upon at the General Convention of 1886,' were printed 'for the Convention,' as embodied in a series of thirty separate resolutions.

What we have already said as to the growth of opinion within the American Church on the subject of Prayer-Book revision between 1883 and 1886 will prevent any surprise at the smallness of the result in the way of actual change arrived at by the General Convention of that year. Cautious and conservative counsels prevailed. Even those who, in the abstract,

des  
tha  
con  
was  
doc  
mig  
tain  
A c  
alte  
feel  
bett  
thor  
nite  
tha  
add  
rita  
som

were  
Boo  
twen  
give  
Nov  
'im  
rent  
imm  
unti  
vent

T  
T

F  
F  
Patr  
C  
I  
\*

C  
'He  
of 'F  
I  
occu

\*  
\*  
Almi

would desired both 'enrichment' and 'flexibility,' had come to feel that the whole subject required much deeper and more careful consideration; that the gain of many of the proposed changes was very questionable, and that generally they opened the door to a dangerous amount of possible alternative uses which might easily result in a very bewildering variety and uncertainty in the mode of conducting the worship of the Church. A dread was felt of the introduction of fresh proposals of alteration at every Triennial Convention, and of a consequent feeling of unsettlement and want of finality. It was thought better to wait, no matter how long, for the mature and thorough consideration of the whole subject, and for the definite ripening of general public opinion within the Church; that so, whenever the time should arrive, such changes or additions as should be finally accepted might then be authoritatively adopted *en bloc*, and so the question set at rest for some time to come.

Meantime some changes, mostly very much for the better, were made and finally adopted and incorporated in the Prayer-Book by the General Convention, which sat at Chicago on twenty days between the 6th and the 28th of October last. We give them as summarized in the *New York Churchman* for November 6, placing an asterisk before those which, as being 'important changes,' have been printed for convenience, apparently by authority, in a four-page leaflet, as 'taking effect immediately, but not to appear in the text of the Prayer-Book until further order shall have been taken by the General Convention.'

The Transfiguration inserted in the Calendar on August 6.  
Table of Lessons.

#### MORNING PRAYER.

Print *Gloria Patri* after rubric following *Venite*.

Permits *Gloria in Excelsis* after the Psalms instead of the *Gloria Patri*.

Omits printing *Gloria in Excelsis* here.

Inserts rubric before *Benedictus*.

\* Full form of *Benedictus*.

Change of rubric before Apostles' Creed, requiring the words: 'He went into the place of departed spirits,' in case of the omission of 'He descended into hell.'

Insert 'again' after 'He rose,' in the Apostles' Creed, wherever it occurs.

#### EVENING PRAYER.

\* Permission to omit the Confession, except on Sunday.

\* A short exhortation, 'Let us humbly confess our sins unto Almighty God.'

Print *Amen* after first form of Absolution.

Change rubric directing people to repeat the Lord's Prayer with the minister 'wheresoever else it is used in Divine service.'

Print *Gloria in Excelsis* in Order for Evening Prayer, for permissible use after the Psalms instead of the *Gloria Patri*.

\* Insert *Magnificat*.

Permission to use 42d Psalm, instead of *Magnificat*, *Cantate*, or *Bonum est*, during Lent.

\* Insert *Nunc Dimittis*.

Permission to use Psalm xliii. during Lent.

Same order as in Morning Prayer, respecting the Creed.

\* Restore 'Lighten our darkness,' from English Prayer-Book.

#### THE LITANY.

\* Add the suffrage, 'That it may please Thee to send forth more labourers into Thine harvest,' with response.

#### THE COLLECTS, EPISTLES, AND GOSPELS.

The Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for a Sunday shall serve all the week, when not otherwise ordered.

Places after Collect, &c., of Christmas Day, those of St. Stephen, St. John Evangelist, and Innocents' Day.

Epiphany collect, &c., are to serve for every day after, unto the next Sunday.

Same for Ash Wednesday collect, &c., except on St. Matthias' Day.

Same for Ascension Day collect, &c., except upon the Feast of St. Philip and St. James.

Title of 25th Sunday after Trinity to be 'the Sunday next before Advent.'

\* Inserting Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for Transfiguration.

#### ADMINISTRATION OF THE HOLY COMMUNION.

Orders a minister repelling a communicant to report to ordinary 'within fourteen days.'

\* Omit Doxology from Lord's Prayer at beginning of the office.

\* Decalogue may be omitted at earlier Celebration when there are more than one on the same day. In place of it read, 'Summary of the Law.'

For the words, 'Then shall be read the Gospel, the people all standing up,' substitute these: 'Then, the people all standing up, he shall read the Gospel,' also *Gloria Tibi* to be 'said or sung,' instead of 'people shall say.'

Permission to use offertory sentences on any occasion where alms are received.

Transfers the two Exhortations following Prayer for Church Militant, to end of the Office.

\* Permits the longer Exhortation in the Office to be omitted except once a month.

\* Orders *Ter-Sanctus* to be printed as a distinct paragraph, the people to recite with the priest, 'Holy, Holy, Holy,' &c., and not the introductory paragraph, 'Therefore with angels,' &c.

Orders the Invocation in Prayer of Consecration, to be printed as a distinct paragraph.

'Here may be sung a Hymn' after the Consecration, instead of 'Here shall be sung a Hymn from the Selection for the Feasts and Fasts.'

'Some other Hymn' may be sung instead of *Gloria in Excelsis*.

For 'if' read 'though,' in last rubric but one, at end of the Office.

#### OFFICES OF HOLY BAPTISM.

Directs the people to stand until the Lord's Prayer.

Slight verbal alteration in rubric before the Gospel.

Print 'Amen' in Roman type in the prayer which the people repeat with the minister.

Add in both forms of Certification of Private Baptism, these words: 'Who is now by Baptism incorporated into the Christian Church; for our Lord Jesus Christ doth not deny His grace and mercy unto such infants, but most lovingly doth call them unto Him, as the Holy Gospel doth witness to our comfort.'

Changes in second and third rubric in Office for Baptism of Adults—merely formal.

In closing Exhortation of same Office, for 'representeth' read 'doth represent.'

#### CONFIRMATION OFFICE.

Adds to first rubric directions for the candidates and congregation to stand, the Bishop 'sitting in his chair near to the Holy Table.'

After final Blessing insert rubric: 'The minister shall not omit earnestly to move the persons confirmed to come, without delay, to the Lord's Supper.'

#### COMMUNION OF THE SICK.

At end of Office insert rubric, providing that the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel for the day may be used, instead of those in this Office.

#### THE BURIAL OF THE DEAD.

Provides for the singing of a Hymn or Anthem, saying of Creed and fitting prayers from 'this Book.'

Allows the whole Burial Service to be said in the church 'for weighty cause.'

#### THE CHURCHING OFFICE.

After third rubric to read: 'Then shall be said by both of them,' &c.

#### PRAYERS TO BE USED AT SEA.

Change title of third collect to read: 'Prayers to be used in all ships in storms at sea.'

Grouping separately prayers that have reference to a storm, and

those that have reference to the enemy; and changing position of the Lord's Prayer to follow the Absolution.

Thanksgivings re-arranged.

#### THE VISITATION OF PRISONERS.

Omit the words 'Minister' and 'Answer' before the versicles that follow the Lord's Prayer.

Substitution of collect, 'O God, whose nature and property,' &c., for the collect after the versicles, and new arrangement of prayers and *Miserere*.

Change title of Prayer for Persons under Sentence of Death, to read, 'Form of Prayer,' &c.

Omit prayer for imprisoned debtors.

Change rubric after the Blessing to read, 'The minister shall use such devotions as he shall think proper;' and add, 'It is judged best that the criminal shall not make any public profession or declaration.'

#### THE PSALTER.

Assign Psalm cxli. to the evening instead of to the morning of the twenty-ninth day of the month.

#### CONSECRATION OF A CHURCH OR CHAPEL.

Omit from title all that follows 'Church or Chapel.'

In the prayer for those who are to be confirmed, substitute 'vows of their Baptism, and be confirmed by the Bishop,' for the longer clause in the old version.

Supply as alternative Lessons, Gen. xxviii., at v. 10; Rev. xxi. at v. 10.

Omit rubric prescribing metrical psalm.

#### INSTITUTION OF MINISTERS.

Omit from the title all that follows the word 'Churches.' Provides that the Bishop shall Institute.

Omit from letter of Institution the words 'Assistant Minister.'

Omit Standing Committee's Letter of Institution.

Alter rubric before proper psalms to indicate that the Bishop is the officiant; but an institutor may be appointed by him.

Same in rubric preceding the Challenge.

Omit from the Challenge 'Assistant Minister.'

Mentions the Bishop as Institutor in first rubric after the Challenge. The same reference in second rubric.

Omit 'Assistant Minister' in the Warden's presentation of keys.

Use the word 'Institutor,' instead of the words 'Instituting Minister.'

Similar change in rubric following the Lord's Prayer, and read 'Diocesan' instead of 'State.'



In place of anthem *Laudate Nomen*, substitute Psalm lxviii., or Psalm xxvi.

The Bishop, when present, is to make the address prescribed in this office in the form of a letter.

For much of this we may well be thankful, especially for the restoration of the Gospel Canticles in their fulness, and of the omitted article in the Apostles' Creed, and for the insertion of the additional suffrage in the Litany.<sup>1</sup> But we are quite of the opinion of the 'Rev. D. C. Roberts, of New Hampshire, who protested against the *Gloria [in excelsis]*, which properly belonged to the Communion Service, being used anywhere else' (The *Churchman*, Report of General Convention).

We may also rejoice in the omission, which we trust was final and decisive, of some of the recommendations of the Joint Committee; such, for example, as that of a crude and fanciful service, wholly without precedent, founded on the 'Beatitudes of the Gospel,' and proposed for use after the Third Collect at Evensong instead of the usual prayers.

But, while we admit that the re-insertion of the Athanasian Creed was not within the limits of the original commission of the Joint Committee, we may be permitted to express the most profound regret that the opportunity was not taken to conform the American Prayer-Book to English and, indeed, universal Catholic usage, in the two important points of (1) the restoration of the Lord's Prayer between the *Kyrie* and the *Preces* in the ordinary Offices; and (2) due provision for the recitation of the Nicene Creed in its proper place in the Liturgy. It is an astonishing fact, and one that ought to be remembered as the measure of the difficulties against which faithful American Churchmen have had to contend, that their original Prayer-Book, that of 1785, absolutely does not contain the Nicene Creed at all! and, indeed, makes no provision for the recitation of any form of belief whatever in the Holy Communion Service! This grievous omission has drawn its retribution after it in the adoption (subject, as 'Bishop' Cummins's 'Certificate' of December 8, 1873, takes care pointedly to remind his followers, to yet further 'revision') of that book by the 'Cumminsite Schism,' which can colourably plead that it stands on the original platform of American Churchmanship. We cannot be quite sure how this matter,

<sup>1</sup> Compare the petition in the Litany in *Marshall's Primer* of 1535, 'That Thou vouchsafe to send us plenty of faithful workmen into Thy harvest. We pray Thee to hear us.'

which is one of very serious importance, now stands. The summary which we have given from the *Churchman* does not include it; but its report (November 6, 1886, p. 599) of the proceedings of the 'House of Deputies' on the nineteenth day says that

'Resolution 15 was on the saying of the Apostles' and Nicene Creed in the Communion Office, and the following rubric was adopted:

'Then shall be said the Creed commonly called the Nicene, or else the Apostles' Creed; but the Creed may be omitted if it hath been said immediately before in Morning Prayer: *Provided*, That the Nicene Creed shall be said on Christmas Day, Easter Day, Ascension Day, Whitsun Day, and Trinity Sunday.'

Perhaps this was not carried in the House of Bishops; and it will be observed that in any case its proviso does not ensure the recitation of the Nicene or of any Creed, even on the four great festivals named, *in the course of the Communion Office*. To speak our real mind, this is an enormous blot. Surely—if it is not a joy to American Churchmanship to say the Creed, and that in the fullest form accessible, at every proper opportunity, and if it cannot away with two Creeds in two immediately consecutive services—much the better way had been to give leave to omit the Apostles' Creed in *Matins*, whenever the Liturgy was immediately to follow, and, in the great Eucharistic service, to preserve that which the true Catholic ever feels to be the one ground of his most soul-lifting, most heart-stirring, thanksgiving: the one formula in which (saving the *Filioque*) the three great branches of the one Catholic name are yet most mercifully one; the one corner-stone on which, if ever, the restored unity of Catholic Christendom will be upbuilt.

Among other points omitted or delayed we may note (1) The proposed large addition to the Occasional Prayers and Thanksgivings following the Litany; (2) The Office of Prayer for Sundry Occasions (a useful idea if properly and correctly carried out); (3) A Special Burial Service for Infants. For our part, we are more than content that all these should wait, the first especially; and that because ere long we may hope the Committees which both our own Convocations, in their recent sessions of February last, re-appointed 'to frame additional services,' may ere long be engaged upon the same work of supplying what is now very generally felt to be a defective and insufficient portion of our Book of Common Prayer. The Joint Committee of York and the two Committees of Canterbury will doubtless make arrange-

ments to act together in this most important undertaking; and, whichever may be moved to make the first advance, we earnestly hope that all three will be somehow enabled to act in concert with our American brethren who have been designated by their Church to the same task.

### NOTE ON THE JERUSALEM BISHOPRIC.

WE should be false to our convictions and should forfeit our self-respect if we failed to put on record an expression of deep and unfeigned regret, which we are sure is shared by our readers, at the deplorable revival of the project of the Jerusalem Bishopric. The *Guardian* of February 23, 1887, contained an official announcement from the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, in conjunction with the Bishop of London, of their intention to repeat, with some merely formal variations, the disastrous mistake of 1841 by appointing an Anglican 'bishop in Jerusalem and the East.' Misgivings such an announcement must in any case awaken; but these misgivings swell to consternation when we find that for a moiety of his stipend the new bishop is to be indebted to two societies—the Church Missionary Society and the Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews—which would probably be the first to repudiate any sympathy with those Church principles and that Church order of which the *Church Quarterly Review* claims to be an exponent and a champion. The Church Missionary Society in particular enjoys a sinister reputation for its work of proselytism among the Christians of the Orthodox Church, a work which they complain, forsooth! has suffered considerably 'from the vigorous and well-sustained efforts of the Greek Patriarch to draw away and keep away from them all those who have any connexion with his Church' (*Proc. C. M. S.*, 1886, p. 58). We do not need to be reminded that now, as in 1841, the most reverend promoters of the scheme repudiate the notion that it will be any business of the new bishop to give his aid and countenance to any such schismatic acts of proselytism; but experience teaches us how utterly futile and sterile are these asseverations, which the Church Missionary Society, or a bishop like Bishop Gobat, would certainly treat as so much waste paper.<sup>1</sup> If a bishop had been appointed as overseer of the English clergy and congregations in the Levant and in the East, with specific instructions to live in open

<sup>1</sup> Considering that the Church Missionary Society (*Report*, p. 61) speaks of having under its charge a body of 1,633 baptized native Christians (exclusive of teachers, of both sexes), we fail to see how the Archbishops can state that 'to make English proselytes of the members of those (*i.e.* the Eastern) Churches . . . is not after the spirit or usage of this foundation,' *i.e.* of the bishopric as founded in 1841.

communion with the Patriarch, and to sympathize with him in his endeavours to educate and improve his clergy and people, as well as to counteract and as far as possible to put down the mischievous, unwarrantable, and schismatic proceedings of many proselytizing societies which are hindering the Patriarch's work—no great harm, and possibly great good, might have been done. And we have no doubt that it was a bishop of such a type, and with such prescribed duties and functions, that the Patriarch had in his mind when he expressed his readiness to 'receive him with much affection' at Jerusalem (see *Guardian*, February 23, 1887). But unless the Church Missionary Society abandons the claim which it ordinarily makes to regulate the doings of the clergy whom it maintains abroad by the decisions of a committee at home, the new bishop, under the contemplated arrangement, will either sink into being the *employé* of the Society, or will be embroiled in unceasing and unseemly altercations with it, and also with the Patriarch, to the serious detriment of peace and influence.

We shall not attempt to dress up again in our own feeble words the irresistible logic and the earnest and eloquent expostulations with which Canon Liddon—that true *Defensor Fidei*—has protested against this most disastrous project in the columns of the *Guardian*. There is one point, however, on which we do not remember that he has touched, and to which, in conclusion, we will briefly advert. It is to express our earnest hope that no respect of persons will induce the two really Church Societies—the S.P.G. and the S.P.C.K.—to give any countenance or support whatsoever to the scheme as it stands. It is possible that our rulers in their first appointment may have selected a bishop who will act in friendly sympathy with the Patriarch, and who will feel bound to abstain from proselytizing, or from abetting proselytism in others; but, considering the sources whence the funds for the maintenance of the bishopric have been sought and obtained, and the influence which the holders of the purse can always exercise in appointments, there is no security that his immediate and other successors will be like-minded or act in a like spirit; and we do not see how this security is to be obtained. Failing it, the sin of schism will ultimately lie at the door of the English Church, and weigh on the consciences of English Churchmen. It will be for the members of the S.P.G. and the S.P.C.K. to show by articulate protest on the one hand, and by dignified abstention on the other, that they will have neither part nor lot in furthering a course of action which will plant the same sense of wrong in the minds of our fellow-Christians in the East as is already implanted in the minds of the Copts of Egypt—a sense of wrong, remember, which it will be difficult to eradicate, and which will irreparably weaken the position of the Anglican communion in Christendom as a branch of the Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

P.S. Since the above was in type, a memorial to the Archbishop of Canterbury has been published in the *Times* (March 22, 1887), together with his Grace's reply. The memorial greatly strengthens our

case, and we rejoice to find we are in entire accord with the distinguished men whose names are appended to it—'men famous in the congregation, men of renown.' His Grace's reply does not make us desirous to modify anything we have said. In truth, if we may say so with all due respect, it seems to us to leave matters worse than they were before. His Grace again refers to the deplorable Convention of 1841, and to the Commendatory Letter of the same year, and to Archbishop Howley's letter, and further states that 'he does not share the fears of the memorialists with regard to the work' of the Church Missionary Society. His Grace betrays no consciousness of the fact, of which he can scarcely be ignorant, that the principles enunciated and the pledges given in the documents just mentioned have been persistently set at naught by that Society, which is to furnish so large a quota to the new bishop's stipend, and by Bishop Gobat, the occupant of the see. Nor is this all. While thus reticent as to the past his Grace would not appear to be in a condition to assure us that the Church Missionary Society has given any explicit guarantee that for the future it will adopt any different line of action. His Grace's reply concludes with a courteous assurance that 'the suggestions of the memorialists will receive respectful consideration.' In courtesy, we may be well assured, Archbishop Benson will never be found wanting. But when a crisis comes, something of tougher fibre than mere courtesy is surely needed in the Chief Pastor of the English Church. We want backbone.

### SHORT NOTICES.

*Creed and Character* : Sermons by the Rev. H. S. HOLLAND, M.A., Canon of St. Paul's. (London : Rivingtons, 1887.)

FIVE years ago, a series of sermons, the first of which, on *Logic and Life*, gave its name to the whole volume, established Mr. Holland's position in the front rank of brilliant and stimulating preachers. It might indeed be thought, as was said in our pages, that there was here and there perceptible a certain want of proportion and balance, and that 'the rushing torrent of thought and images' had not in all cases worked itself clear. The sentences were sometimes inordinately long, and the illustrations too luxuriant for the subject. If a 'ritualistic' metaphor be permissible, one could not always see the vestment for the orphreys. In the present volume the style is materially chastened; it has become simpler and graver: if there are fewer of what Johnson would have called 'coruscations,' there is, perhaps, a deeper and steadier glow. Occasionally we find the same abundance of adjectives and participles as accentuating the point in hand (pp. 138, 184, 263); repeatedly we are charmed at once by the naturalness and the delicate finish of some felicitous combination of terms; or the prevailing richness is enhanced by contrast with some racy colloquialism, as that 'emotion' which 'feels so strong needs but a bad quarter of an hour to collapse' (p. 130), or that when

'after an interval you meet a man whose life is bad,' but who at first seemed attractive, 'obviously he has not got on' (p. 258). We feel, as before, that we are dealing with a 'prose poet,' there is the irrepressible responsiveness to the varying aspects of nature, to the 'sodden woods slowly dropping their dead leaves' (p. 253), the 'crashing' downward sweep of a mountain stream (p. 196), the tides that 'run up on the flood, cheerful, brimming, and immense' (p. 153), or 'roll and swing and murmur under the moon' (pp. 54, 156). This fondness for water-imagery may seem characteristic of a peculiar liveliness and sensitiveness of mind which is one of Canon Holland's special gifts, and which enables him to vivify afresh the most familiar Biblical incidents. Many preachers now attempt thus to 'make Scripture history real,' but sometimes they simply vulgarize it. The operation needs such pure refinement as is native, so to speak, with Canon Holland. He can modernize Gospel words without compromising either taste or reverence. He paraphrases the suggestion, "'Send them away into the villages:" we never brought them here: they must look to it for themselves: we are very sorry' (p. 106). Or the nobleman is made to entreat as if he were an English parent, 'Heal my boy whom I love; he is very ill!' (p. 195). Or the Lord's face 'bends over Peter's as he makes his great confession:' or the disciples 'creep, cowed and alarmed,' behind Him on the way to Jerusalem: or 'a tiny thing, a folded napkin,' makes 'a bolt shoot back somewhere in the breast' of St. John, and he 'passes at one bound out of death into life.' Or St. Paul is brought into contact with 'tradesmen and justices of the peace:' or his spiritual history becomes a picture, he 'flames out against compromises' with Judaism, 'the joy of the mystery' of grace for Gentiles 'burns like a furnace in his soul,' and 'pours out of his heart like a strong flood.' More difficult still—what our Lord Himself must have felt, but did not express, is suggested: 'He was never to know on earth' the gladness of those who should reap 'the white fields' of the world's harvest (p. 163): boldest of all, yet hardly too bold,—after the reply to 'whom say ye that I am?' the relief that it must have given is depicted in connexion with the task of building the new house of God: 'At last, at last, He is through the sand; He has touched ground; He can begin' (p. 49).

Sympathy is ever strong, vivid, inexhaustible, in Canon Holland. With him, if we mistake not, the difficulty would not be in its supply, but in its control. These sermons show an intense appreciation of the trials caused by suffering, and an insight, which might be called Pauline, into the difficulties which Christianity encounters in its appeals to men of science, of business, of energy, to buoyant youth and to prosaic middle age. The preacher can 'transfer to himself' all these conditions; he knows how to 'speak a word in season' for each; his whole soul goes forth in the endeavour to show that each is considered and provided for in the teaching and kingdom of the Everlasting Word. And while he insists on the 'ugliness, odiousness, stupidity, stagnation' of sin, he shows himself aware of the fascination which it exercises over its victims, of the misery of 'this



incessant collapse' (p. 217). Throughout this book we see that which pervaded the earlier volume, a 'never-failing elevation of spiritual feeling and judgment' (*Church Quarterly Review*, xv. 23) and a loyal enthusiastic devotion to Him whose Mind 'ought to be felt behind the word and voice of the preacher, as an energy of which the preacher is but a tool' (Pref. p. vi.). That Mind is described as expressing its thoughts and purposes in the Creed, and as producing a certain type of character. Against 'the absurd and ignorant commonplace' which would separate Christian ethics from Christian doctrine, we are reminded that 'the belief' is the 'ground-work of the character,' and that 'when the Creed goes,' the Christian moral ideal goes with it. 'Nothing can help that.' But how does belief establish itself? St. John is represented in the first two sermons as having learned to recognize the glory of the Only-begotten by feeling His infused power in the 'double form' of grace and truth. And modern Christians, it is urged, may, under the shock of seeing an increase of disbelief, support themselves by this apostolic experience, say, 'Lord, to whom shall we go?' and secure that 'inner faith' which comes from 'waiting upon Christ, learning His words,' and clinging to Him by love (pp. 15, 33). There is one paragraph in which a reader might at first suppose that 'the searching criticisms which encircle' the Gospel narratives could only be met by a spiritual apprehension, the result of a subjective experience (p. 94); and although the 'perplexities' which they produce are described as a 'dream,' it might have been better to say more about the case which can be set forth in answer to such criticisms; the rather that one great assumption, which seems to underlie so many of them, is repeatedly and absolutely contradicted in Canon Holland's representation of a truly miraculous Christ. We may here add that it is hardly accurate to call the feeding of the five thousand 'that first Eucharist of the ministering Church' (p. 102), or to speak of Christ as 'the one forgiven Man,' because through Him, as the one sinless Son of man, Divine forgiveness would 'begin to work' (p. 225). But in both cases the context clears up the meaning.

Want of space compels us to pass over many topics on which the theological student, as well as the ordinary Christian reader, will gain important help from a teacher whose removal from Oxford is felt as a heavy loss. We would gladly quote him on 'heredity,' atonement, grace, 'letter and spirit,' &c. But one point must not be omitted, which is all the more striking because of the habitual spirituality of his tone. Dr. Hatch is quoted (p. 56) as saying, 'If organization had had the importance which many attach to it, that importance would have been marked in the Sacred Record. The main facts of that Record are clear enough.' Certainly they are, says Canon Holland; and he proceeds to show at length how they exhibit our Lord as mainly occupied during His ministry in 'organizing' an Apostolate to be the nucleus of 'a duly ordered Church.' With a view to acting on the many, who could not understand Him, He set Himself to train the few, who should be the 'organ of distribution' of His gifts. He 'never imagined a faith

which should not involve a Church; He did not intend men to accept Him as individuals, and then, 'for reasons of expediency,' to unite with each other in a society. On the contrary, He prepared an 'organic body' for His Spirit, an 'instrument to act visibly on the world,' a household 'with distributed ministries and regulated offices,' in which the completion of 'the marvellous organization of the Episcopate' was to be reserved for the Apostle who had 'read deepest into His secret.' Thus 'organized order is the stamp of Christ upon His Church' (pp. 63, 78, 87, 88, 99, 116, 119).

To not a few of Canon Holland's readers, the Cuddesdon festival sermon will have a peculiar interest; and in that sermon, the concluding pages, which so touchingly describe the wise and tender discipline associated, in the grateful recollection of so many of the younger clergy, with one beloved and honoured name. Canon Holland's beautiful book will be to such readers all the more precious, because it will thus remind them of all that they owe to the present Bishop of Lincoln.

*Biblical Essays; or, Exegetical Studies on the Books of Job and Jonah, Ezekiel's Prophecy of Gog and Magog, St. Peter, 'Spirits in Prison,' and the Key to the Apocalypse.* By CHARLES HENRY HAMILTON WRIGHT, D.D. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1886.)

THE contents of this volume are sufficiently indicated by the title-page. It consists of five essays or 'Studies,' as the author prefers to call them, on the subjects referred to, and designed for popular use rather than 'as scientific monographs.' The chapter on the Book of Job is a revised and corrected edition of 'a sermon-essay,' published in 1864. The second 'Study' is on 'The Book of Jonah,' which Dr. Wright considers as an allegory—or, to adopt his terminology, 'a historico-symbolical prophecy.' This is certainly the best and most readable part of the book, even although we fail to perceive with Dr. Wright any reference to the Book of Jonah in our Lord's Parable of the 'Prodigal Son.' The 'study' on 'Ezekiel's Prophecy of Gog and Magog,' which is 'to show that the prophecy is no prediction of Russia,' but has a grander and more practical object, does not call for any special remark. As regards the last essay, which is an interpretation of the Apocalypse based on the vision of Rev. xii., we feel it difficult to enter in a 'Short Notice' on a discussion of questions so complicated. Suffice it to state that Dr. Wright regards as 'the key to the solution of the allegory and to the correct comprehension of the larger portion of the Book of the Revelation itself,' the interpretation that 'the man-child' of Rev. xii. 5 is Christ, 'the dragon' Satan, 'the woman' the Church. The '1,260 days' during which 'the woman' was fed in the wilderness, as well as the 'time, times, and a half' (v. 14), he considers 'a period . . . undefined and indefinable;' 'a mystical cycle,' which 'represents a definite time in the Divine reckoning, but men cannot discover its exact duration.' If little comfort can be derived from this interpretation, there will, on the other hand, be many to object

to the further statement that 'the notion that a great Antichrist is to arise at the close of the dispensation is . . . a simple delusion, grounded on a misconception of certain portions of the Sacred Scriptures.' Nor do we imagine will Dr. Wright find more general acceptance for the view that 'Michael,' spoken of in v. 7, is Christ—the war in heaven' meaning the 'contest in heavenly places'—or that the description of Satan as 'cast out into the earth' is equivalent to the expression of our Lord in St. John xii. 31; or, lastly, that the 'woe to the inhabitants of the earth and the sea' of v. 12 has 'its counterpart in the warnings of St. Paul (Eph. vi. 12–16) and of St. Peter (1 Pet. v. 8, 9).' We leave it to our readers to judge whether, whatever elements of truth such interpretations may contain, they either answer to the requirements of the text or can be fitted into the context.

But the essay to which most who peruse this volume will probably turn with greatest interest, but which, we fear, will also most disappoint them, is that on 'The Spirits in Prison—a Study on 1 Pet. iii. 18–20 and iv. 6.' The difficulties of these passages are sufficiently obvious, and we would be most grateful for any real help in their solution. But while on the one hand we occasionally fail—no doubt the blame being ours—clearly to understand the meaning of Dr. Wright, we are bound to add that where we do understand we cannot accept his interpretations. Probably our difficulties might be lightened if we had a more distinct perception of the precise meaning which our author attaches to the Descent of our Lord into Hades. The general position of Dr. Wright, apart from his differences from Dean Plumptre and other writers on the subject, is that there is not 'any allusion whatever to Christ's Descent into Hell' either in 1 Pet. iii. 18–20 or in iv. 6. In this contention Dr. Wright has, we feel assured, set himself a sufficiently arduous task. Without entering into detailed discussion, we shall state some other interpretations proposed in this essay. When we read that our Lord was 'put to death in the flesh but quickened in the Spirit,' we are to understand by the expression that while 'death put an end for a season to His Bodily life, that event was, however, the beginning of a higher spiritual life'—in short, that it 'refers to the Spirit-life into which Christ entered when He surrendered up His Spirit to the Father.' But considering that, according to Dr. Wright, 'St. Peter speaks of the life of which man cannot deprive his fellow in any case whatever, the life of the spirit or pneuma,' it is difficult to perceive the meaning of the word 'quickened,' or why, indeed, any special mention should have been made of what, after all, is the common boon of humanity. But the difficulties only increase as we proceed. 'Quickened in the spirit,' then, means that Christ, although put to death in the flesh, 'was kept alive' 'in the higher part of His nature.' Hence, when we further read that 'in the Spirit He preached to the spirits in prison,' this refers, says Dr. Wright, not to 'Christ's work in His disembodied state,' but to the period 'when "in the Spirit," prior to His Incarnation, Christ as the Pre-Incarnate Word, preached to the antediluvian race, "the world of the ungodly"! In further

illustration of this view Dr. Wright regards it as 'highly probable' that, prior to His Incarnation, 'Christ was manifested to the angels in an angelic nature,' and became in some special manner an angel or 'spirit.' Thus the Pre-Incarnate Logos had, if not in angelic form, yet as 'a spirit prior to His Incarnation,' in some visible manifestation, preached to 'the spirits in prison, that is, to an antediluvian world,' or, in other words, to 'the spirits now in prison on account of their disobedience in the days of Noah.'

Want of space prevents our entering on the explanation offered of 1 Peter iv. 6, which indeed involves even more difficulties, on Dr. Wright's theory, than the passages just commented upon.

*The Bible an Outgrowth of Theocratic Life.* By D. W. SIMON.  
(Edinburgh : T. and T. Clark, 1886.)

THERE is much in this little volume which is both interesting and useful, even though we may take the liberty of doubting whether it will greatly advance our understanding of the question of 'Inspiration.' Dealing with a subject of such importance, and, in some of its aspects, of such difficulty, we have carefully perused the book with the object of ascertaining whether the standpoint which the author claims to occupy more fully and consistently than his predecessors, enables us to gain a new view of the question. But while giving the writer full credit for candour, sincerity, and earnestness, and while admitting that in some respects he has more clearly set certain points before us, we have failed to discover anything that is really new or that will contribute to the final settlement of the matter.

In one respect, the title of the book is somewhat of a misnomer. It might lead readers to suppose that Mr. Simon regarded the Bible as simply the outcome of the God-guided, and in a sense God-inspired, life of Israel. But, by the side of this factor, the author distinctly recognises a direction not subjective but objective—an immediate Divine agency operating, and that, not only in regard to the contents of the Biblical record, but even the modes of their expression. 'I believe,' writes Mr. Simon (p. 40), 'most fully both in revelation and in inspiration, as those words have been understood by the best and greatest teachers of the Christian Church.' And when, for further elucidation, we turn to Chapter X.—which, to our thinking, forms the most valuable part of the book—we find this preliminary statement of his position fully made good. When, by the side of the human element in Scripture—or, as our writer would prefer to call it, Hebrew literature—we turn to the part which he assigns to the 'Divine element,' we find not only a distinct recognition of it, but also of its direct and objective character. The only qualification of this—of course, by the side of the full recognition of the purely human element in Scripture—is, on the one hand, that the two elements so 'often blend and are inseparable' that only a tutored and sympathetic eye can discern the Divine and distinguish it; and, on the other hand, that in the 'living co-operation between the Spirit of God and the human minds' there is variation of proportions,

'doubtless according to mood, circumstance and subject ; but never actually ceasing' (p. 134). To this position—which, when rightly understood, is certainly tenable—the writer frequently reverts. He tells us that 'the Divine element, having been present in varying degrees and modes in the objective life [of Israel as a nation], varies correspondingly in the reflex ;' that 'some portions of them [the Scriptures] will be, if I may use the expression, fuller of God than others,' and 'that the Divine action would vary according to the men, the subjects, the circumstances, alike in degree and manner.' But this varying measure of inspiredness—we purposely coin the word to distinguish it from inspiration, the one representing the subjective, the other the objective aspect—has, although on other grounds, been fully recognised by the oldest thinkers on the subject. Every one knows that the Rabbis made, for example, a difference in this respect between the Law and the Prophets, and probably again between the Prophets and at least certain of the Hagiographa, the canonicity of some of which was a matter of discussion. And most interesting in this respect are the various utterances of Philo, logically inconsistent though they be, as so much in his thinking, and incompatible with his fundamental view of inspiration. The four passages in which the great Alexandrian expresses his views on prophetic inspiration are in *De Monarch.*, close of Book I. ; in *De Leg. Spec.* § 8 ; in *Quis Rer. Div. Her.* § 52 ; and in *De Præm. et Pæn.* § 9. To these should be added, as regards inspiration generally and Philo's personal claims to it (as well as of those similarly minded with him), *De Mundi Opific.* § 23 ; *Quis Rer. Div. Her.* § 53 ; and *De Cherub.*, §§ 9, 14. But, although Philo attributed a special pre-eminence to Moses, yet he curiously distinguished even in him a threefold difference of inspiration : the highest when he spoke in the Person of God ; the second when human question and Divine answer were intermixed ; and the lowest when he spoke in his character as Law-giver, although gifted with a share of prescient power (*De Vita Moysis*, III., §§ 23, 24). Similarly, if we understand Mr. Simon aright, the agency of the Divine factor is conditioned and limited by the personality of the speaker or writer, by the subject, and by the circumstances. Possibly this might give a valuable position, and might be further defined or modified by the statement that the Divine light from without, on the one hand, shone with brightness determined by the *medium* through which it had to pass, while on the other hand it increased in brilliancy unto the perfect day of full and final Divine communication.

We have been led into these remarks partly to vindicate our opinion that on this aspect of the question no perceptible advance, at least in principle, has been made in this book. In justice to its treatment we must add that the writer throughout recognizes by the side of the purely human element in the substance—or better, the subject-matter of the Bible—a direct Divine revelation also ; while as regards even the form, or the words, in which this subject-matter was communicated, he not only distinguishes once more the human element, but also insists on Divine inspiration as directing and guid-

ing in this respect also. Thus there is by the side of the human a Divine factor alike as regards the substance and the words of Scripture. In Chapter X, of which we here renew our commendation, this is shown in detail in reference to the historical books, the Prophecies and the Epistles, and the poetic books—or, as our author describes them, the books which record life; those which embody Divine communications; and those which embody the thoughts and sentiments of men (Psalter, Lament, Cant., Job, Prov., Eccles.). But when after the vindication of these as facts we come to what after all is the main question of enquiry with those who receive Holy Scripture as the record of Divine Revelation—we mean, in what manner and in what measure the Biblical writers were inspired—our author fails to give us any definite principle or canon. He says concerning 'the nature and compass of the influence which the Spirit of God exercised on the writers of the Hebrew nation' that 'it is clearly impossible to determine it with anything like exactness in the individual cases,' and that probably those who had most experienced Divine action could have only given a very vague account of their experience. That may be so, but it really avoids the question, and fails to furnish some broad, intelligible principle applicable to the subject.

But we have said enough for the purpose we have in view, which is alike to indicate the contents of this small volume and to encourage its writer to proceed on the path on which he has entered. His present production is one of promise. If we may take the liberty of offering advice, it would be that his studies should be directed more to primary than to secondary sources. *Fontes exquirite*. He quotes rather extensively than deeply, and some of his citations seem scarcely to deserve the estimate which he puts upon them. The subject is wider and deeper than the authorities which he quotes. Viewed as a course of lectures to students, we have little doubt that it must have proved both interesting and useful to his hearers.

*Grammatical Analysis of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek Scriptures, consisting of the Original Text Unabridged, the Parsing of every Word, with all its Prefixes and Affixes, and a Literal English Rendering.* By ROBERT YOUNG, LL.D. The Book of Psalms in Hebrew. (Edinburgh: George Adam Young and Co., 1885.)

As the title implies, this is one of the series of grammatical analyses of the original text of the Old Testament by which Dr. Young seeks to assist and lighten the labour of the student—especially of the beginner in Hebrew. The plan of the work is to take every word as it successively occurs in the sacred text (in the present instance, in each Psalm), and to construe or parse it. To this is added, by way of grammatical appendix, the paradigms of the verbs, pronouns, and substantives, and lastly some well-executed reproductions of specimens of MSS., Samaritan and Hebrew (both ancient and modern, printed and unprinted), as well as Greek (of which no less than sixteen are given, including the Codd. Vat. Alex. and Sin.), and Syriac (including the Cureton).

Having thus described the contents of this small publication, we



gladly take the opportunity of assuring Dr. Young of the sympathy which every student must feel with the indefatigable industry of this veteran Hebraist, and of our respect for his wide reading and earnest purpose in all his work. We do this the more readily that we are bound to express alike some misgivings and certain objections as to the book before us. To begin with, we greatly doubt the use, even to beginners, of such 'crutches' as a text, parsed word by word. In the long run they are more likely to prove hindrances than helps, so far as the acquisition of a knowledge of Hebrew or a proper understanding of the text is concerned. The student should be encouraged and admonished to learn to construe for himself, and the information derived from 'a crib' will not teach him grammar, while it may very possibly mislead him in interpreting a passage. But if a student, using the term in a charitable sense, does wish such help—other (and as it seems to us) more innocuous, is at hand. In the late Mr. J. B. Davidson's *Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon* he will find every word in the Hebrew text analysed, together with explanatory references to the grammar prefixed to the work, and also footnotes to illustrate passages in the Old Testament. Another auxiliary of the same kind is Freund and Marx, *Präparationen zum A. Test.*, of which three little volumes have appeared (Genesis, the Psalms, and Isaiah). In these, after a translation, only the more difficult forms are analysed [the analysis not being repeated where the same form recurs], while very brief notes, chiefly grammatical, are added. Lastly, we have *Elias Hutter's* folio edition of the Hebrew Bible (Hamb. 1587), in which, although not always correctly, the root of every word is marked by ordinary type either in the word or above the line, the rest being printed in hollow letters.

To the general objections thus indicated we are sorry to have to add some special exceptions. Thus it is not very clear why Dr. Young should in the course of the first Psalm give us no less than four times the root of רשעים (רשע), which surely every one knows, while in very many—and sometimes not quite easy—words the root is not at all indicated. Again, as regards grammatical construction, it seems strange that—to choose an instance from the first two Psalms—in Psalm ii. 3, it should not have been mentioned that ננתק and נשליכה are in the cohortative. Finally, as regards the rendering, we can as little admit that ננתק can be rendered by: 'We draw off,' as Dr. Young has it, than we can approve of his translation in Psalm i. 2 of בחרת יהוה by 'in the direction of Jehovah.' These instances are taken from the first column of the first page. We fear we should have to multiply them if we were to pursue our examination further. But as at the beginning, so at the close, of this brief notice we would guard ourselves against being understood as expressing anything inconsistent with sincere respect for the erudition and acknowledgment of the labours of the author.

*The Pulpit Commentary: Isaiah.* Vol. I. Exposition and Homiletics by REV. GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A., Canon of Canterbury and Camden Professor of Ancient History, Oxford. Homilies by various Authors. (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, and Co., 1886.)

THE conductors of the *Pulpit Commentary* have a right to consider themselves fortunate in the scholar and divine whose name is at the head of this volume. Though not one of the two or three living writers whose names occur involuntarily to the English reader as having made themselves by long and successful study of the prophecies of Isaiah *facile principes* in their interpretation, his reputation for sound and conscientious work is deservedly high, and every reader will feel sure that any comment for which he is responsible will be constructed with industry and painstaking care, as also with competent learning. His General Introduction to the Commentary will be found an exceedingly able statement of the evidence for the unity of the whole prophecy. The only remark that we need make is that it would have been well to render it complete by setting out the phrases quoted in evidence *verbatim*, instead of referring to them only. The notes on separate verses seem generally terse and sensible, but this volume extends only from chap. i. to xxxv., and consequently many, or indeed most, of the *cruces* of exegesis are still to be dealt with. We cannot agree with Professor Rawlinson where he discusses the date of the vision recorded in ch. vi., and decides against Dr. Kay (in the *Speaker's Commentary*) that the phrase 'in the year that King Uzziah died' means *before* his death. Surely the earlier critic is right here. The remark 'Why mention Uzziah at all?' seems inconclusive if not altogether irrelevant.

It were much to be wished that the Homilies were as good as the Exposition and notes, but we cannot say that this strikes us as being the case. The Homiletical Index, however, is an excellent idea.

*System of the Christian Certainty.* By Dr. FR. H. R. FRANK, Professor of Theology at the University of Erlangen. *Second edition.* Revised and Improved. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1886.)

THE whole of this lengthy work comes to little more than an expansion of St. Paul's sweeping canon, that 'the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned.' That is to say, the domain of Christian faith has its own laws, peculiar to itself and not to be confounded with those which obtain in the world of nature. Also they are apprehended by a special sense, gradually developed in the course of expansion which is undergone by the Christian character. The author distinguishes the 'Christian certainty' from the 'natural certainty,' out of which it arises and which forms its basis. This certainty of the natural reason is by no means abolished or even rendered unnecessary, though the degree of spiritual enlightenment dispenses at length with logical steps and amounts to an intuition. Of course all this

is not new. It has often been glanced at by theologians, and is in fact the truth which underlies Tertullian's famous paradox 'Credo, quia impossibile est;' but it has never before, so far as we are aware, been drawn out so completely and exhaustively (we cannot unfortunately say so *clearly*) as in the treatise before us. Dr. Frank's *copia verborum* is ample, inexhaustible, and meanders on till the reader's attention is dulled. Were it only like Sir John Denham's River Thames—

'Though deep, yet clear; though gentle, yet not dull;  
Strong without rage; without o'erflowing full'!

But unfortunately this is not altogether so; and though the treatise is a valuable and useful one, and deals with a most important subject in a pious and scholarly fashion, we are constrained to say that it is far too much diluted with words and would be greatly improved were it condensed into a fourth part of its present length.

We append as a specimen a very suggestive paragraph, dealing with what we may call the Philosophy of the Vicarious Atonement of our Lord.

'The fact of the vicarious expiation is so unique in its nature that the substitution here before us cannot be measured by a canon which we have derived from vicarious actions elsewhere occurring, but is either not to be comprehended at all or is to be comprehended from itself. That the human race as apostate and anti-godly was under arrest for the rendering of a death-bringing expiation unto the absolute God, and that by means of the second Adam given to this race the same absolute God procured the rendering of a life-bringing expiation, by which the race was restored to that position towards God corresponding to its idea—where else had this fact a parallel on account of which it could be classed with others under a common norm and rule? Anomalous in itself it is not by any means on this account, but the rule which it follows is the idea of the second creation whence it arises' (p. 471).

*Apologetics; or, the Scientific Vindication of Christianity.* By J. H. A. EBRARD, Ph.D., D.D., Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. Vol. I. (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1886.)

'It is indeed true,' says Dr. Ebrard in his preface to the first (German) edition of the work before us,

'that the positive testimony of the guilt-extinguishing and sin-subduing grace of God in Christ has its power in itself, and exhibits the same in all those who have become conscious of their guilt and weakness; but how many thousands are there in our day who do not reach such a longing desire for salvation, *because the last foundations upon which the consciousness of the ethical antithesis of good and evil rests, and the desire of salvation becomes distinct and clear, have already been removed from under their feet by the theorems of the materialistic spirit of the age.*'

That which is here expressed with characteristic German ponderosity is undoubtedly one of the most regrettable features of our time. The consciousness of immortality, the feeling of reverence, the underlying sense of sin, are being sedulously blotted from the conscience of humanity, as far as their power can avail to effect it, by the teachers of materialism. Here is the most serious battle-

ground of our age. It is much to be regretted that theologians, or at least that apologists, are, as a rule, not intimately acquainted with physical science, since it is precisely in this domain that their most formidable foes are to be looked for; and it is because Professor Ebrard speedily makes it clear that he wields a masterly and accurate knowledge of scientific processes and results that we regard the treatise before us as exceedingly valuable.

Its express purpose is to establish the great Christian truths regarding the descent of man, the homogeneousness of his moral nature, the creation of the world by an Almighty Power, and similar standards of doctrine; and this is done in all cases upon strictly scientific grounds and with a command of all the resources of science, also with a strong logical power, which can hardly fail to win the admiration, even to extort the assent of the reader, however prejudiced he may be. It is not a treatise the argument of which can be epitomized; it must be read through for its singular power to be at all adequately appreciated. We may, however, give one specimen of its curious learning, *e.g.* with respect to the spot of the bodily organism in which the soul has its *habitat*.

'Some, therefore, have thought that they must search in the direction of an altogether definite, single point or spot in the brain, which is the "seat of the soul." (Descartes, as is well known, believed to have found in the pineal gland "this seat of the soul.") Every such-like representation, however, is preposterous, for physiological as for philosophical reasons. There is in the brain no organ to which all vital functions, psychical and intellectual, converge, or from which all start together. The functions of the reflective consciousness are in the large brain, those of sense perceptions in individual peripheral parts of the large brain (*e.g.* the perceptions of the sense of sight in the bump of sight, *thalami optici*); the involuntary vital functions are bound up with the little brain and the *medulla oblongata*. So much has resulted with certainty from observation of the injuries andickenings of single parts of the brain. There is no single place in the brain through whose annihilation these different functions would be altogether annulled. The brain consists of two symmetrical halves. There are (Hartm. c. ii. p. 339) established cases where the one half has through disease become incapable of officiating and the other has vicariously discharged the entire functions. Therefore the possibility of a unified (control) point, which might be the seat of the soul, is unconditionally excluded. With this physiological reason a philosophical one goes hand in hand. If the monad had a spatial, extended existence it would be a "corporeal thing," *i.e.* a complex of powers; consequently not a monad, but mathematically and dynamically divisible. We must therefore reject as false the representation, as if the vital monad or "soul," *i.e.* the ego, as animating the body, dwells in any one molecule or any other minor organ of the brain as in a closet and from thence directs the organism. The monad, as incorporeal and non-spatial, is present rather in the system of its organs, only just in a differentiated manner' (p. 140).

The English translation seems to be very well executed; but we notice one sentence made altogether unintelligible on p. 180. Line 26 should read, 'You may see the substance of the nerves in a corpse.'

*Official Year-Book of the Church of England.* (London: S.P.C.K., 1887.)

THE opponents of the Church sometimes do good service to its cause in ways they little intend. This has certainly been the case with the misrepresentations of the Liberation Society in so far as they have led to the annual improvement and enlargement of the very useful book mentioned at the head of this article. Whilst pertinaciously resisting an accurate census of the professed members of the various religious communities in England and Wales, the members of that Society from time to time seek to impose fancy census tables of their own upon the public; and if these tables should be found to present a different aspect of affairs from that which their promoters desire, they are as zealously scouted and repudiated as they would be earnestly and admiringly held up for universal acceptance if they showed the Church to be that miserable minority in some parts of the country which their platform orators unblushingly assert. Such misrepresentations demand to be corrected in an age of general education like the present, when there are comparatively few people who do not read a newspaper, and almost as few, if they are men, who do not influence the fortunes of the country by voting at elections. The editor of the *Official Year Book* has boldly and fairly taken the course of trying to set forth the exact facts with regard to the Church of England, without considering whether they tell for or against her numbers and powers. It is true he has not condescended to employ fancy enumerators who shall count the persons present in church and chapel on some given Sunday, when unscrupulous partisans may whip up their adherents, and even secure their being counted several times over at different places of worship; but, instead of that, he has endeavoured to obtain the most accurate account of what the Church is doing through her various organizations and in her various fields of work; and this year he has given us the numbers baptized, confirmed, and who have communicated during the past twelve months, also the fullest particulars of the various religious and charitable objects in which Churchmen are interested. Some of this information has been gathered for the first time in the volume just issued, and we congratulate the editor on the success which has attended his first attempt to gather the statistics of what the Church is doing in the 13,808 parishes in England and Wales. These, though far from complete, will be found to cover a large portion of the ground, but very differently in different dioceses. In that of Manchester 475 incumbents out of 503 have answered the long table of questions sent them, whilst in Durham only one out of 234 incumbents, and in Newcastle two out of 171 neglected to reply, and it is more than probable that this omission was occasioned by the illness of the incumbent or a vacancy in the benefice. On the other hand, of the 900 incumbents in the diocese of Norwich only 743 responded to the editor's request for information; in the diocese of St. Alban's 404 out of 601, and in St. Asaph 122 out of 206. The aggregate

results show that four out of five, or 80 per cent. of those to whom the questions were sent, gave the information sought for; and we trust that another year those who have not answered this time will have realized the importance of these tables being complete, and will take the trouble to comply with the editor's request. The whole population of the country is stated to be twenty-six millions, from which a large reduction has to be made for the one-fifth of the parishes which sent no answer. The baptisms number 463,732 (of these 12,938 were adults), or about 2 per cent. of the population included in the returns; the confirmations 205,753, or nearly 1 per cent.; the communicants 1,181,915, or between 4 and 5 per cent. The churches will seat 5,161,548 persons, or more than one in five of the population; and of these seats the unappropriated are in the proportion of more than  $2\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 to the appropriated. There are nearly a million and a half of scholars in Church Sunday schools, and more than 150,000 teachers. There are more than 275,000 persons taught in Bible classes, of whom very nearly one-half are males. There are nearly 140,000 enrolled in guilds; whilst Church institutes and village clubs number nearly 10,000 more members than do the guilds. The returns from the Welsh dioceses go far to prove the truth of the numbers attending church and chapel in the Principality recently published in a Welsh Nonconformist newspaper, and which have been so fiercely attacked by the Liberationist press. They show that in the diocese of St. David's, where replies have been received from 395 incumbents, or all but nine of the whole number, there are 35,373 enrolled communicants, or more than 7 per cent. of the whole population; in Bangor 10,029, or nearly 5 per cent; in Llandaff, although nearly one-sixth of the parishes sent no return, 19,939, or  $3\frac{1}{4}$  per cent.; in St. Asaph, though returns were received from only three-fifths of the incumbents, more than  $3\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. These figures compare not unfavourably with some of our English dioceses, the average number on the roll for Holy Communion in all dioceses being little more than 4 per cent., reckoning the whole population of the country, but it has to be remembered that only four-fifths of the parishes have given returns. In the more favoured dioceses, such as Oxford, the number of communicants reaches 10 per cent. of the population, whilst in London and Manchester it is about 4 per cent. We have dwelt upon this new feature in this year's issue of the *Official Year Book* partly because it is new and partly because it is of great importance at the present time, when efforts are being made to separate the Church in Wales from the Church in the rest of England; and it is obvious from the figures just quoted that if the Liberationists could succeed in their crusade against the Church in the Principality they would soon try to find in that success an additional reason for destroying the present position of the Church in England. The other parts of the book have been, on the whole, well and carefully compiled, and say much for the indefatigable industry and wisely directed thought of the editor; but we regret to have to notice one serious error. On page xv, in giving the educational statistics from 1882 to 1884, he has



added up the figures for the three years, forgetting that each year's figures include the same schools. This is corrected in the fuller statement of educational statistics given on p. 184; but we notice with sorrow that in a book generally so correct such a slip should have been made. He has done well to continue the study of the Church's expansion in individual towns. This year he has dealt with Sheffield, Wolverhampton, Preston, Hastings, and Northampton. It is interesting and encouraging reading, and gives a point to the more general statistics of work, which they would lack without the more concentrated pictures of successful effort for the spiritual and moral interests of the people which these narratives give. We can speak in terms of unqualified approval of the book, and we trust that it will meet with the extensive circulation which its merits demand and which the low price at which it is published invites.

*The Life of Mother Henrietta Kerr.* Edited by JOHN MORRIS, S.J.  
Second edition. (Roehampton, 1887.)

THIS is in many respects a very helpful and inspiring book. The subject of it largely supplies the material for it in brightly expressed and unaffected letters at all periods of her life to her own family and friends.

Her father, Lord Henry Kerr, was, during her early childhood, the Rector of Dittisham, in Devonshire. He resigned his living in 1852, at a time when his daughter was about ten years old. He almost immediately joined the Church of Rome, moved by various causes, but no doubt to some extent by the circumstance that several relatives, among whom were Mr. James Hope and the Marchioness of Lothian, had just taken the same course.

Young as she was, Henrietta Kerr had her views about the step, and they were not favourable to it. Her will was always of the strongest. But she soon accepted it, and from that moment there was no faltering. She was naturally too thorough to do anything by halves. In her own mind she soon definitely decided that she must become a nun, but her father's consent was not obtained at once to the idea. She worked on, however, nobly and bravely, to overcome her natural faults and weaknesses. Nothing of effort came amiss to her. At one time she would fight with a habit of impatience, at another with a habit of stooping, while with heart and soul she threw herself into riding, skating, dancing, music, reading, and the perfecting herself in all home duties. In all she was the leading spirit.

At length, with the full consent of her father, she joined the Society of the Sacred Heart at Conflans, from which she was passed to a branch of the Society in Rome, where she was living during the troubles caused by the withdrawal of the French troops, when her convent was invaded. She finally came to an establishment of the Society at Roehampton, where, in spite of weak health and failing strength, she carried on many years of vigorous, refined, able, and loving work, and there she ended her noble and useful life. The work for which her many accomplishments, her bright, sunny nature, and her high breeding so well qualified her was the education of girls.

From 1872 until her death there in 1884 she filled the post of Mistress-general of the school. In this office she was untiring. Into this work she carried her own English home experiences, training, and discipline; and those had ever been of the best. She knew nothing of mere sentimentalism. Her very sense of humour was fatal to it, as well as to all irregularity and laxity. 'There is always a blessing,' she says, 'belonging to regularity.' And her own life, in which she ever aimed at the highest, was too full of trials, temptation, and suffering (as much concealed from the eyes of others as was possible) to allow of mere trifling. 'Never a grace without a cross, nor a cross without a grace,' was her way of speaking of it.

Obedience to the will of God was the foundation of her own strength, and such as have successfully practised obedience can usually exercise command. She was rooted in that true humility which believes that nothing can be done by ourselves, but all by God in us. '*Faites-vous à chaque instant un nouveau plaisir de faire la volonté de Dieu*,' was one of her ever-present thoughts. 'Courage and confidence,' she would say; 'live in the present moment and keep your soul free from hurry and worry in the calm presence of God.' 'The present moment is the great secret of perfection; employ this well, and God will provide for the rest' (p. 312). It was not only, as her biographer says, a pleasure to her to understand and do the will of God, but, so far as she could, she made it a pleasure for everyone else to do so. Virtue in her hands was eminently attractive.

In her the supernatural was remarkably blended with all that is highest and best in nature. And she trained others by developing all that was best, most joyous, and truest in them; for her training of herself had not quenched one spark of her humour and playful fun. She, indeed, as her biographer says, served God with joy of heart, as was apparent to all. She was possessed of an 'unfailing gaiety that no toil could dim, no suffering, not even the near approach of death, could extinguish;' and this in spite of very great trials. She writes to her brother—

'My tepidity, aided by physical infirmity, has made me gloomy of soul these last weeks. I will not expatiate on my misery, as this is against my particular examen, which is to turn my eyes away from myself, to fix them on God in a spirit of humility, confidence, and abandonment. I have had it for twenty years, and but for it should have gone into despair, how often! Far above success do I value that humble self-forgetfulness which makes one say, "It is God's will; I can please Him; He is bound to guard me." So one goes straight on one's path blithely' (p. 265).

The practical wisdom of many of her remarks on matters outside the vocation in which she so excelled are very noticeable. She writes to her brother on the subject of preaching, 'I think there are very few eloquent men, but the good is done by the plodding preaching of dogma, which in this nineteenth century is more needed than stirring up à la Bernardine of Sienna (p. 254);' and again, 'I always fancied a retreat alone (no preacher) would suit me better than the preached ones; but I had no idea of the intense luxury of being in

absolute silence and praying after my own fashion without being obliged to keep pace with my neighbours.' In an age like this, when nothing is considered complete without a sermon, such thoughts from such a one are of value.

Good sense was a great element in her character. She would say to her elder girls, 'Do not do extraordinary things, such as lying on the floor and taking too little food, but take instead, by way of penance, the next hard word that is said to you or the next ache or pain which you get. There is then no fear of your thinking yourself a heroine or a saint' (p. 289). Fear of God and horror of sin it was her endeavour to implant in the hearts of her children. Instead of Does such a thing please me? she ever substituted Does it please God? She eminently understood children. It may be noted by persons who nowadays are in the habit of lowering religion, to its great loss, to what they conceive to be suitable for children, that her answer to those who once told her that she spoke above the heads of the children was, 'If only one child has understood me and has had her tone raised, it was well worth speaking so' (p. 280).

At length, in 1884, the end came with great physical suffering, most sweetly and bravely borne. But the radiant peace of her last days was bought at a great price. It came after three days and nights of an agonizing conflict with temptation, which seemed like a real hand to hand fight with the Evil one. Throughout her life she had always realized his personal action. During her residence in Rome she had had sharp conflicts with him on her own account, and later on she often felt that she was engaged in a personal struggle with him for the souls of the children. And now he seemed to be making his last attack. 'He had the worst of it, however: the sharper his attacks were the more gallant was her resistance, the more keen her hatred and contempt of him, the more intense her love for God and God's will above all' (p. 386). To this a perfect peace succeeded. Her last word was the Holy Name, pronounced clearly but with a great struggle.

Mother H. Kerr owed much to her own strong natural character and the good traditions and training of her home life in a class of society which in the last generation had not in many respects its like in the world. And much she owed of good to the wisdom and traditions of the Church of Rome, in which Church she must be viewed rather as a native than as having the responsibilities of a convert; for she followed dutifully in faith, as a child, the example and leading of a father and mother, and with equal simplicity of faith the Church which they adopted. And she had the reward of faith.

Her bright and holy life largely disarms mere criticism. But one cannot pass over without remark the excess of her devotion to the B. Virgin. 'Mater Admirabilis' is the name by which she chiefly speaks of her. To one of her brothers on his recovery from a severe illness she writes (pp. 258, 259), 'It's Mater Admirabilis who cured you. Remember it is her doing. I don't mind your thanking *other people above too* (!), as long as the chief honour is hers.' This and other such expressions (the italics are ours) seem utterly incon-

sistent with her ordinary religious tone, and to verge on profanity. Certainly the language in regard of the B.V.M. on her death bed was in a very different key. Holding in her hands the crucifix, and kissing the five wounds, her language was, 'O Jesus, for love of Thee I love what Thy will giveth me—my Jesus, my own Jesus, my Lord Jesus, my Master Jesus, my King Jesus,' and then lovingly, 'Madonnina mia,' as she kissed the Madonna at the foot, and addressed her, 'Tell me something about Him. He is so merciful, so loving, is He not? Tell me something more . . . He is *all* love' (p. 374). In this, her own simple, childlike self seems to be speaking of the Madonna, and so we leave her.

But certainly the way in which members of the Church of Rome are allowed, if not instructed, to regard and address the B. Virgin, together with the acceptance of her supposed modern appearances at Lourdes and elsewhere, do not tend towards the union of Christendom or towards making the Christian Creed more harmonious and intelligible.

*Science and the Bible; being the Substance of Two Sermons preached at St. Michael's Church, Chester Square.* By the Rev. JAMES FLEMING, B.D., Residentiary Canon of York, Vicar of St. Michael's, Chester Square, Hon. Chaplain to the Queen, and Hon. Chaplain to the Duke of Westminster. Printed by request. (London: Larner and Knight.)

IN themselves these sermons would certainly not be worth noticing. They are rather below than above the average, and contain more than the usual flavour of that vulgarity which seems to us to constitute an invariable ingredient in the productions of a so-called 'popular preacher.' We feel, however, that they ought to be rescued from deserved oblivion as one of the most impudent examples of literary larceny with which it has ever been our fortune to meet. About the first sermon, indeed, there hangs a transatlantic aroma, which makes us extremely suspicious as to its source; but about the second there can be no doubt. It is stolen from a volume of Dr. Talmage's *Fifty Sermons* (second series, second edition, London, 1876, pp. 312–21)—stolen without a word of acknowledgment! Full and condign exposure would require us to print the two sermons, side by side, in parallel columns; but for this, it is scarcely necessary to say, we cannot afford the space. Suffice it therefore to state that Canon Fleming's sermon, or rather the sermon appropriated and printed as his by Canon Fleming, occupies about 260 lines of print. Every word in these 260 lines (with the exception of some thirty lines and of just a word added or altered here and there) is cribbed from Dr. Talmage! The sermons were preached at St. Michael's in June 1880. The second edition of Dr. Talmage's volume bears date 1876. We have said that this Canon of York, this Honorary Chaplain to the Queen, has stolen this American sermon without acknowledgment. But the matter is even worse; for in a sort of preface he actually tries to make the public believe that these sermons were wrung from him in a sort of *facit indignatio* strain by Bradlaugh's admission to

the House of Commons. 'We have lately been well-nigh scared,' he says, 'at the portents which have appeared in the political horizon. The admission of an avowed atheist to the House of Commons has sorely exercised the public mind, *and in this instance [sic] it directed my thoughts to the subject [sic]* in two sermons.' Canon Fleming goes on to state that he prints these sermons 'in the humble hope that the young, and those whose religious principles are still unformed, may be guarded from being drawn into the paths of infidelity,' &c. We have grave fears that in Canon Fleming's manual of 'religious principles' the Eighth Commandment has not found a place. We trust it may be withdrawn from circulation—not the commandment but the manual—at the earliest opportunity; a fate which (if rumour may be trusted) has befallen these sermons.

*Magdalen College and King James II.* A series of documents collected and edited by the Rev. J. R. BLOXAM, D.D., late Fellow of Magdalen College, with Additions. (Oxford: Printed for the Oxford Historical Society, 1886.)

THE present April completes two centuries from the time of James II.'s attempt to override the chartered rights of a wealthy and powerful college in that University which had been traditionally loyal to his house. The story is set forth in this attractive volume, published under the auspices of a society which has already done much for historical studies in Oxford. An excellent preface, by the Rev. H. R. Bramley, Fellow of Magdalen, summarizes the narrative, and explains that the book now published embodies a collection of papers made by Dr. Bloxam, with some additions from other 'MS. material.' We cordially recommend it to our readers, especially to those whose Oxford recollections must often dwell on 'the exquisite buildings of Waynflete, and on the tower which James I. pronounced to be the most *absolute* thing in Oxford.' We do not propose to recite the oft-told tale, but merely to glance at one or two points brought out by these newly published documents. James II.'s perverse folly must not make us forget that he claimed some precedents for his interference with collegiate election; and the case which came nearest to such a precedent was, curiously enough, a high-handed act of the Puritanical boy-king Edward. But Walter Haddon was a very different person from Antony Farmer; and one of the Fellows of Magdalen tersely observed that '*he* was put out in less than a year's time, and reckoned an intruder' (p. 180). James appears to have regretted, when too late, that he had 'carried the thing so far,' and that in his strange conference with twenty-one of the Fellows at Christ Church, Sept. 4, 1687, he had spoken with 'more warmth' than was prudent (p. 269); but we do not fully understand what he meant by saying that he 'had known Magdalen to be a stubborn, turbulent,' 'mutinous, and factious college' ever since the Restoration (pp. 85, 218), unless he had been told by Bishop Cartwright, on Bishop Morley's authority, that the members of 'this noble foundation had been long experienced in the methods of quarrelling with their visitor,' their 'president, and themselves'

(p. 186). One of the intruded Fellows, a Jesuit, took a malicious pleasure in remarking that the expelled Fellows, punctilious as they were about one statutory obligation, had habitually ignored those which restrained them from playing at cards or haunting taverns. 'How this has been observed the common room speaks, where, as the pot and the pipe, so the "tables" and dice were daily exposed for the use of all . . . for many years last past' (p. 246). This is illustrated by the evidence of card-playing and other irregularities at Magdalen in 1506, as cited by Ingram in his *Memorials of Oxford*. Cartwright taunted the Fellows yet more bitterly in his speech on Nov. 16, 1687. Hough's account of his conversation with William Penn at Windsor, Oct. 9, shows that he did not greatly rely on Penn's professions of friendship, but also that Macaulay has strained some of Penn's words into a worse meaning than Hough attached to them (see also Paget's *New Examen*, pp. 316-30). But Macaulay was right in saying that 'even James never committed a grosser error' than when, instead of accepting a qualified submission made by all but one Fellow a few weeks later, he stupidly insisted that they should 'ask pardon for their late offences,' and thereby stimulated them to retract a false step. Then came the general expulsion, followed by a sort of undergraduate revolt against the new intrusive authorities, especially Robert Charnock. Macaulay's sentence, 'One lad who was induced to take a Fellowship was turned out of the hall by the rest,' is a lively exaggeration of the statement that the graduate 'Demies' told this undergraduate Fellow that they would not allow him to sit in hall above themselves, 'upon which he went out of the hall' (p. 217). Poor Dr. Smith, who was too 'loyal,' in his own sense, to join with his brethren in their stand for rights, and thereby incurred much popular obloquy, was deeply grieved to find that Magdalen College was to be turned into a 'Papist' seminary, and was himself expelled in August 1688. But some months previously, the saddest scene in the whole drama took place in the president's lodgings, when Bishop Parker, who had been intruded as president in October 1687, broke down utterly on being commanded to admit nine more Roman Catholics. He walked up and down the room, smote his breast, and said, 'There is no trust in princes. . . . Is this the kindness the King promised me? To set me here to make me his tool,' amid 'men whom he knows I hate the conversation of!' He then 'fell into a convulsive fit, and never went downstairs more till he was carried down.' Such was the end of an Anglican instrument of James II., who, although suspected of Romanizing, repelled in his last hours the advances of Roman priests (p. 240).

*Phantasms of the Living.* By EDMUND GURNEY, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; FREDERIC W. H. MYERS, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge; and FRANK PODMORE, M.A. 2 vols. (London: Rooms of the Society for Psychical Research, and Trübner and Co., 1886.)

THE 'Society for Psychical Research,' as might have been expected, has encountered, since its foundation, a good deal of criticism and a



good deal of ridicule, of which much has certainly been unintelligent. In the present work, which is the first considerable outcome of the Society's labours, we recognize an attempt to deal in a really scientific spirit with a class of phenomena which have never before been thoroughly examined, but which are full of interest and importance.

We have all heard of cases in which, at the time of a person's death, or of a notable crisis in his life, some friend or relative at a distance has seen his 'wraith,' or has had a vivid dream in which his death or critical condition has been in some way indicated. Mr. Gurney and his friends have collected in these volumes a large number of instances of such coincidental 'phantasms,' this term being used to include not only visual apparitions but also 'auditory, tactile, or even purely ideational and emotional impressions' (vol. i. p. xxxv). The body of the work contains 357 such cases, which the authors consider to be fully authenticated, and the supplement contains 327 more, for which the evidence is good though of a less cogent character. A very large proportion of these cases are first hand, a personal interview with the narrator having been procured in most of them; and great care seems to have been taken to sift the evidence. Mr. Gurney (to whom the execution of the bulk of the work is due) is fully alive to the dangers arising from the untrustworthiness of memory, the tendency to unconsciously exaggerate the closeness of a coincidence or round the symmetry of a story, and the possibility of reading back into past experiences details with which the subject of them has subsequently become familiar. Great stress is therefore laid upon the circumstance that the dream or vision should have been mentioned to others, and the time of the occurrence noted, *before* the news of the death (or other event) has reached the percipient. The effort made to verify as far as possible every statement is sometimes amusingly illustrated. Thus, a lady relates that on a certain evening in the year 1850 or 1847 she and a friend were sitting *by the fire*, when the friend saw in the semi-darkness of an adjoining room the form of a young lady who had recently been a guest at the house, and who was subsequently found to have died at nine o'clock that very evening. The obituary in the *Gentleman's Magazine* being referred to, it seems that the death in question took place on July 8, 1847. Whereupon application is made to the Greenwich Observatory to ascertain what the temperature was at 9 p.m. that day, in order to judge whether the detail of sitting by the fire is likely to be accurate. The temperature is found to have been 60°, and some doubt is accordingly thrown upon the trustworthiness of the narrator's memory.

Here and there, of course, opinions will differ as to the evidential value of particular cases which Mr. Gurney has cited, but the conclusion which follows from the evidence as a whole is irresistible. The social position of many of the narrators, the tone of the narratives, and the care taken to eliminate as far as possible all known sources of error, make it impossible to doubt that in the main the narratives are narratives of fact. Unless we are to reject all human testimony, we must admit that death, or some special crisis, on the one hand,

and the phenomena of 'phantasms' on the other, are frequently coincident.

Mr. Gurney emphatically and repeatedly disclaims any belief that these phantasms are of a supernatural character. He regards them, that is to say, as subject to natural laws. And he is no believer in 'ghosts' of a quasi-material and objective character. The apparitions are all classed by him as cases of *hallucination*. They only differ from other hallucinations in that they convey a true impression as to a fact of the actual world. They are 'veridical,' or truth-telling. The first question, therefore, which arises is whether the coincidence which distinguishes them is due to chance. This is sometimes urged. People talk as though most of us habitually experienced an hallucination about once a week, in which case there would be nothing very remarkable in this occurring now and then on the same day as the death of a friend. The Society for Psychical Research, therefore, undertook some time ago a sort of census in order to ascertain how frequent such experiences really are. As an example of the results, it may be said that out of 5,705 sane and healthy persons selected at random only twenty-one were found to have experienced a *visual* hallucination representing a living person known to them, in the last twelve years, two, however, having had the experience twice.<sup>1</sup> Now Mr. Gurney gives 'thirty-two first hand and well attested *coincidental* cases of this type which have occurred in this country within the specified time.' It is difficult to say what section of the population these latter may be considered to be drawn from. Mr. Gurney puts it at 300,000. He calculates that if this be so the odds against the coincidences happening by chance are a trillion of trillions of trillions to one (vol. ii. p. 17).

But if chance be excluded, what other account of the matter can be given? The explanation offered by Mr. Gurney and his collaborators is that of 'thought transference,' or to use the convenient word which they have coined, 'telepathy.' Under this term they include all cases of the impression of one mind by another otherwise than through the recognized channels of sense (vol. i. pp. xxxv, 6), and that such impression is possible they claim to have established by direct experiment. This was at first suggested by the well-known 'willing game,' and the feats of so-called 'thought-reading' exhibited by certain public performers. It was soon found, indeed, that the phenomena in their popular form were almost wholly due, not to *thought-reading*, but to *muscle-reading*. Faint and usually unconscious indications were given through the grasped hand or touched finger, and served to guide the 'thought-reader' in finding a hidden object or writing slowly with a piece of chalk upon a black-board. But the second chapter of Mr. Gurney's work contains an account of a long series of experiments made without contact or under conditions where muscle-reading was out of the question. In particular some very curious and interesting facsimiles are given, showing the reproduction

<sup>1</sup> We do not find it anywhere stated how many of these twenty-three cases were 'veridical.'

by two young ladies of rude drawings not previously seen by them, and under conditions which precluded anything like collusion.

It is urged that these experiments and certain phenomena of 'hypnotism' or 'mesmerism' place beyond question the fact that under certain conditions genuine thought-transference, or 'telepathy,' does take place. It is a *vera causa*. And Mr. Gurney proceeds to apply it to the cases of apparitions and other 'phantasms' to which we have referred. His theory (broadly stated) is that a telepathic impression is conveyed from the mind of the dying or distressed person to the mind of the friend at a distance, and this impression is externalized by the percipient in the form of a hallucination.<sup>1</sup>

It will be noticed that the title of the book excludes the subject of phantasms *of the dead*. What is relied upon, indeed, to prove that an apparition is anything more than a merely subjective hallucination, due to an abnormal state of the brain or nerves, is usually just the fact that it coincides more or less with the death of the person whose form is seen. But such apparitions are found to group themselves round the moment of death in a remarkable way, occurring with less and less frequency as the distance of time from that moment, *in either direction*, is greater. This suggests strongly that the apparitions after death, no less than those before, are definitely connected with that crisis, and it is assumed in the present work that all the phantasms recorded are those of 'persons who are still living, as we know life, though they may be on the very brink and border of physical dissolution' (vol. i. p. xxxv). The authors are careful not to exclude the possibility of psychical communication after death, but it is argued that a telepathic impression conveyed while the agent is still living may be unconsciously received, and may remain dormant for some time in the percipient's mind, so that it may not *take effect* till after the agent's death.

It must be added that both Mr. Gurney and Mr. Myers consider that the facts before them are quite incompatible with a merely material or physical explanation. An attempt has been made to set up a theory of 'brain waves' akin to that of electrical induction. But the simple fact that 'telepathy' appears to act as readily between opposite sides of the globe as between one room and the next at once negatives the supposition that it is analogous to any of the physical forces with which we are acquainted. The phenomena must, in fact, be treated as purely psychical, and so far as the facts are established, they deal one more blow to the doctrines of materialism.

Mr. Myers argues, indeed, that these investigations throw a fresh light upon one point in what he calls the 'ancient controversy between Science and Faith.' He writes :

<sup>1</sup> It should be mentioned that Mr. Myers puts forward in a separate note a somewhat different theory of telepathic action, which we cannot now discuss. It is connected with problems of great difficulty which arise in certain classes of cases, and which ultimately resolve themselves into the question of the relation of the phantasms to space.

'I claim, at least, that any presumption which science had established against the possibility of spiritual communion is now rebutted; and that inasmuch as it can no longer be affirmed that our minds are closed to all influences save such as reach them through sensory avenues, the Materialist must admit that it is no longer an unsupported dream, but a serious scientific possibility, that if any intelligences do in fact exist other than those of living men, influences from those intelligences may be conveyed to our own mind, and may either remain below the threshold of consciousness or rise into definite consciousness, according as the presence or absence of competing stimuli, or other causes as yet unknown to us, may determine' (vol. i. p. li).

How far such considerations are likely to lead unbelievers to accept religious truth may be questioned, but it is at least satisfactory when objections raised on the part of scientific men are met on scientific grounds by those who cannot be accused of bias in favour of the theological position.

*Christianity, Science, and Infidelity: A Series of Letters, vindicating the received Truths of our Common Faith, showing the Follies and Absurdities of Atheism.* By Rev. W. HILLIER, Mus. Doc., Wingrave Manse, Aylesbury, Bucks. With a Prefatory Recommendation by the Rev. HENRY VARLEY. Second edition. (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1885.)

THIS little book is written with evident earnestness and good intentions, and is intended to meet the sceptical teaching of Mr. Bradlaugh and his school. Unfortunately the author does not seem to realize the difference between assertion and argument. He says 'the facts of Christianity are as morally certain to the mind of the writer as the first axiom in Euclid is self-evident' (p. 14). But this will hardly help those to whose minds the Christian faith is beset with difficulties. The author tells us that 'Christianity is the greatest fact in the world,' that 'Christianity is true,' that it is 'sublime in its doctrines, beneficent in its character, good in its tendency,' and that 'every person with common-sense will regard the words of Mr. Owen as the essence of absurdity, and those of Mr. Bradlaugh as the quintessence of rash presumption' (p. 21). But we find no attempt to remove the difficulties which these writers allege, and which so many people at the present day feel to be real. In regard to the being of God, Mr. Hillier relies upon the somewhat antiquated propositions of Dr. Samuel Clarke's *Boyle Lectures*, whose *à priori* arguments, by the way, he does not appear to have quite understood. He speaks of miracles as involving a suspension of the laws of nature, and then cites the diffusion of gases in the atmosphere and the expansion of water at freezing as instances of miracles. A number of chapters are devoted to the Argument of Design, but there is not a word in them about the doctrine of Evolution. The writer seems to be unconscious that this has any bearing on teleology. One chapter is headed 'Is Man a Developed Monkey?' and in it we are told that Dr. Darwin 'does not attempt to give a single case or example to prove his theory' (p. 115). Mr. Hillier can hardly have read a page of

Darwin's works. He shows moreover that he understands his theory to be that a horse may develop into a cow, or a dog into a cat.

The book appears to have reached a second edition, and must therefore have appealed to a certain class of readers, but we cannot recommend it to any who are troubled with the real problems of our age. The chapters in which encouragement is drawn from the failure of all sceptical attacks on Christianity in past generations may possibly do good. For the rest, the best intentions will not supply the place of a competent knowledge of the subject.

*Daniel: an Exposition of the Historical Portions of the Writings of the Prophet Daniel.* By the Very Rev. R. PAYNE SMITH, D.D., Dean of Canterbury. (London: Nisbet, 1886.)

THIS is a useful *moralis expositio* of the Book of Daniel; but we notice it as propounding a solution of a historical difficulty about Belshazzar. More than thirty years ago a cylinder inscription was found in which King Nabonidus prays to the Moon-god for his 'eldest son' Bilu-sarra-utsur,—or Bel-sarusar, as Dean Payne Smith writes it. This was an attestation of Belshazzar's historical position as a Chaldean prince. But was he King of Babylon? Another inscription, more recently discovered, in recording the events of the last year of the monarchy, says that on the 14th of Tammuz (June) Sippara was taken, and Nabonidus fled; on the 16th, Gobryas, the general of Cyrus, entered Babylon without fighting. Afterwards Nabonidus was taken and imprisoned in Babylon; on the 3rd of Marchesvan (October) Cyrus came to Babylon; and on the 11th Gobryas was set over Babylon, and 'the King' died. (See Sayce, *Fresh Light from Anc. Mon.* p. 145.) What room, then, is there for Belshazzar's kingship, as set forth in the fifth chapter of Daniel? Dean Payne Smith in effect answers: While Nabonidus was 'endeavouring to resist' the Elamite invaders outside his capital, Belshazzar, who, according to this same record, had long before been 'associated in the government,' was acting as the king in Babylon, and, trusting to 'its strong walls,' expressed his contempt for internal 'disaffection,' in which he knew the Jews to 'share,' by a great feast and by an insult to their 'exclusive religion;' but on that very night the conspirators betrayed the city, and Belshazzar 'was slain' before he could well have heard of his father's flight, and four months before his father's death in prison. 'Darius the Median,' whom the Dean does not venture to identify with Gobryas, is described as 'holding' under Cyrus 'the reins of nominal authority, with, possibly, some measure of administrative command' in 'the internal management of the kingdom' (p. 268). The book is vivid and suggestive, and one of the best things in it is a reminder that 'the strength of most of the arguments of materialists, and the real cause of the doubts they occasion, consist in our own want of spirituality.'

*The English Historical Review.* Edited by the Rev. M. CREIGHTON, M.A., LL.D. Nos. 4 and 5. (London: Longmans, 1886-7.)

This Review—on the general scope and character of which we have dilated on a former occasion (*C. Q. R.* for October 1886, p. 246)—

well sustains the promise of its first three numbers. Under the triple division (1) of 'Articles,' (2) of 'Notes and Documents,' (3) 'Reviews of Books,' it embraces such a variety of subjects and of periods that it would be hard indeed if its readers did not find something in its pages to suit their tastes, or help them in their pursuits. To confine ourselves to those topics which are most nearly allied to our own department of inquiry, we would call special attention to a masterly article in No. 4 on 'The Origines of the University of Paris,' by the Rev. H. Rashdall, which bears ample evidence of laborious and well-directed research into the constitutional history of Universities, 'the side of their history which has been most neglected' (p. 666). Next to this in importance (from our point of view) we would place 'The Restoration Settlement of the English Church,' by one who has a right to be listened to as a thorough master of his subject, viz the Rev. Nicholas Pocock. The following passage will interest some of our readers :

'It is often urged that the compilers of the second Prayer-Book professed that the new book was only a new form of the first book more fully explained and interpreted, and that, therefore, under our present Prayer-Book, which was formed from the second Prayer-Book, any deviation from it which is sanctioned by the first Prayer-Book is permissible. But no honest person who studies the two books could come to any other conclusion than that this was a downright lie, invented for a political purpose. It was a pure invention made for the purpose of quietly getting the second Prayer-Book through the Houses of Parliament' (p. 682).

The same writer, in No. 5, p. 110, calls attention to a document at Lambeth which seems to have hitherto escaped the notice of all historians. It is a copy of a bull issued by Pope Alexander VI., confirming a previous and well-known bull of Innocent VIII., which decreed the succession of the English crown to the descendants of Henry VII. This confirmation shows how uneasy the King must have been as to the tenure of his throne. Next to this stands a very interesting and masterly reply from the pen of Mr. W. S. Lilly to a critique of his 'Chapters of European History,' which Mr. Symonds had contributed to the July number of the Review. It is an elaborate defence of the Jesuits from the trite charges which are brought against them, and which form the staple of Mr. Symonds's most recent work, *The Catholic Reaction*, on which we shall have something to say in a future number of the *Church Quarterly Review*. It will be understood that we are here only calling attention to those articles which would be most interesting to churchmen. The so-called 'general reader,' however—that nondescript individual who we strongly suspect reads nothing in particular—will find much to attract him.

*The Classical Review*. Vol. I. No. 1. (London : David Nutt, 1887.)

WE heartily wish all prosperity to this new venture in the field of classical literature, under the editorship of Mr. J. B. Mayor (not to be confounded with Mr. J. E. B. Mayor, the editor of *Juvenal*). The



list of contributors on the cover of this first number is to some extent a guarantee of the solid basis and backing on which the Review has been started, under the auspices of that excellent and enterprising bookseller and publisher, Mr. David Nutt. We presume the large format with double columns—our special aversion—has been selected with an eye to possible illustrations in future numbers. Otherwise we confess we prefer the ordinary octavo form in which, for example, the *Classical Museum* was issued under the able editorship of that veteran scholar, Dr. Leonard Schmitz. In this first number the names of such contributors as Ellis, Nettleship, and A. Sidgwick arrest attention. We are a little surprised, however, that the last-named has condescended in a serious Review to notice the vulgar claptrap of a *Pall Mall Extra*, with reference to the Collins controversy on the study of English at the Universities. Mr. A. S. Murray makes an ingenious attempt to explain the 'pristæ' of the sculptor Myron (Plin. *N. H.* xxxiv. 7) as referring to a game of 'see-saw,' as depicted on some painted vases in the British Museum. He may or may not be right in this. But we feel confident he is wrong in his interpretation of Aristophanes, *Acharnians*, 36. The words  $\chi\omega\ \pi\rho\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\ \delta\pi\eta\nu$  have nothing to do with the game of 'see-saw.' A pun *is* intended, as the scholiast intimates. Mr. W. G. Clark used to render it (we are not sure whether he borrowed the rendering from Frere's translation) 'That grating "buy"-word was not.' Mr. E. L. Hicks (the eminent epigraphist) commences what promises to be an interesting series of papers 'On some Political Terms employed in the New Testament.' The Review is to appear monthly for ten months in the year. We shall watch anxiously for the subsequent numbers. There is a misprint in what is somewhat funnily called 'Editorial' (is this an adjective or a substantive?) on p. 1, l. 19 from the top.

*The Babylonian and Oriental Record: a Monthly Magazine of the Antiquities of the East.* Nos. 1 to 5. (London: David Nutt, 1886-7.)

THIS excellent periodical is intended to supply a deficiency by furnishing a means for publishing the results of cuneiform decipherment. Such publications have long existed on the Continent, but nothing has yet been done in England, although the British Museum is the largest repository of cuneiform materials, containing, as it now does, over sixty thousand clay tablets and inscriptions. These Assyriological researches are of course calculated to throw light on the Bible, and these five numbers contain not a few elucidations of very great interest. We may mention as instances Mr. George Bertin's notes on 'The Burning Fiery Furnace,' which are intended to show that Nebuchadnezzar was not guilty of a wanton act of cruelty: his object was by the purifying influence of fire, in accordance with Babylonian tenets, to drive away from the blasphemers' bodies the evil spirits who possessed them. Each of the five numbers contains a translation of a hitherto undeciphered inscription by that rising scholar, Mr. T. G. Pinches, who seems to be in the front rank of modern Assyriologists.

*The Dublin Review*, October 1886 to January 1887.  
(London : Burns and Oates, 1886-7.)

THE two most readable articles in the October number of the *Dublin Review* are by lady writers, viz., that on 'Longfellow' by Miss Helen Atteridge, and that on the 'Present Position of China' by Miss E. M. Clerke, which gives a most able *résumé* of the progressive revolution of thought now fermenting within the unwieldy mass of Chinese civilization. One interesting feature of the *Dublin Review* is the publication of the original text of important Papal Briefs, of which we often have only very inadequate reports in the daily papers. We have in this same number three such Briefs, viz. (1) that in favour of the Jesuits; (2) the long Letter of Exhortation to the Bishops of Hungary; and (3) the Letter constituting an Episcopal Hierarchy in India, which gives a most graphic account of the action of the Church of Rome in that part of the world in former times. In the January number we commend to the notice of the S.P.G. an article on 'Protestant Missions in Southern India—Tanjore.' Mr. W. S. Lilly gives a forcible exposition of 'Mr. John Morley's' opinions on things in general and on religion in particular. The Rev. A. Hamilton, O.S.B., has an interesting account of 'Ancient Benedictine Customs.' But the gem of this number is a most admirable article by N. J. Synnott on 'The Influence of Fatalism on Opinion.' Never was there a time when such a protest against what the Duke of Argyll has called 'The Reign of Flabbiness' was more needed than in the present day. Mr. Synnott does not single out for attack any particular party: 'This loss of grit and fibre,' he says, 'this tendency to drift, to bend to what is supposed to be irresistible, is, as I hope to show, a common feature in the formation of political opinion of every shade and leaning;' and thus we hear people say, 'Disestablishment is sure to come one of these days,' or 'The Deceased Wife's Sister Bill is sure to pass sooner or later,' or 'Home Rule in Ireland is only a question of time.' This kind of Necessitarian jargon is the curse of our age. Another interesting article by Miss E. M. Clerke gives a sketch of the 'Portuguese in India.' 'The Story of the French Exiles' is a review by the Rev. T. E. Bridgett, C.S.S.R., of what would appear to be a very curious account of the French ecclesiastics—some ten thousand in number—who spent their exile in England during the French Revolution. It is entitled, 'Le Clergé Français réfugié en Angleterre. Par F. X. Plasse.' (Paris : Victor Palme, 1886.)

BRIEF NOTES ON NEW BOOKS, NEW EDITIONS, PAMPHLETS, &c.

*Last Words.* Being a Selection from the last Sermons of the late W. J. E. Bennett, M.A., Vicar of Frome Selwood. With an Introduction by H. L. Sidney Lear (London : Skeffington, 1887). There is a certain amount of pathos about this volume. The last of the sermons it contains was prepared for Sunday, August 15, 1886; but early on the morning of that day Mr. Bennett was lying speechless, and never recovered consciousness before he passed away on August 17. There is nothing very striking in this little volume. But to those who as they read can supply from memory the incisive de-

livery, the kindling eye, the unaffected solemnity of the preacher, it will be a welcome souvenir. *The Blessed Dead in Paradise, Four All Saints' Day Sermons preached in Salisbury Cathedral*, by Robert G. Swayne, M.A., Chancellor and Canon Residentiary (London: Rivingtons, 1887), is a book which will find its place on the shelves of all those who have 'loved and lost,' and who, so to speak, are ever on the stretch to gain a glimpse through the portals of Paradise. Mr. Swayne has some very pregnant remarks on the various readings and renderings of Rev. xiv. 13. Compare the same words in the Burial Service. The subject of these sermons is to some extent an emotional one, but we are glad to see that Mr. Swayne has treated it with great solemnity and reserve.

*Modern Hinduism, being an Account of the Religion and Life of the Hindus in Northern India*, by W. J. Wilkins, of the London Missionary Society (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1887), gives in the space of about five hundred pages a very complete and interesting account—gathered, as it would seem, from personal observation—of the Early Life, the Sects, the Caste, the Worship, the Women, the Morals, and of the Views about Death and the Future Judgment, prevalent among the Hindus of Northern India. We know of no one book which gives the same amount of curious information, and with so small an admixture of 'padding.'

*The Homiletic Magazine*, vol. xv., July to December 1886 (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1886), is much below the average. There is a general feebleness of treatment throughout. The only exception we feel disposed to admit is the opening article by Canon Rawlinson on the relation to Biblical Theology of ancient Egyptian systems. *Future Probation. A Symposium on the Question, Is Salvation possible after Death?* (London: James Nisbet and Co., 1886) is a collection from an earlier volume, or rather volumes, of the *Homiletic Magazine* on a subject of universal and endless interest, handled by representatives of various communions. Many will be glad to have these papers reprinted in a collected form. *The Theological Educator*, edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, M.A. (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1887) is the title under which the energetic publishers propose to issue a series of Theological Manuals, of which two volumes have appeared, which we can most cordially recommend. One is entitled, *A Manual of Christian Evidences*, by the Rev. C. A. Row, M.A., Prebendary of St. Paul's Cathedral, who has made that subject his special study, and writes accordingly with a compactness and an unhesitating directness which we cannot too highly praise. The other manual is *An Introduction to the Textual Criticism of the New Testament*, by Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., Professor of New Testament Criticism in the Western Theological Seminary, Alleghany, U.S.A. This little volume gives a very good notion of the intricacies to be unravelled by anyone who is disposed to take up the study of New Testament criticism.

*The Agricultural Depression and the Sufferings of the Clergy*, by R. E. Prothero, Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford. (Reprinted from the *Guardian*), (London: *Guardian* Office, 1887) is a pamphlet

which at the present time ought to be circulated far and wide. The questions involved are of the very gravest moment to clergy and laity alike, and it is only by the diffusion of accurate statements drawn up after a careful investigation of facts that any solution can be arrived at of the enormous difficulties which have to be overcome. Mr. Prothero has done invaluable service in this direction. He not only points out existing evils, without any tendency to exaggeration, but he suggests remedies of a very practical character.

The National Society has undertaken a series of sixteen wall prints of Scripture subjects for schools and mission chapels, or for home use, with the object of raising the treatment of such subjects to a higher level. To use their own words :

‘ The aim in this series is to offer greater attractiveness in design and colour, together with a rendering of the inner soul and sentiment of the Life of our Blessed Lord, more true and more deeply felt, and hence more impressive and convincing, than has yet in general been attained. For this purpose the attempt here made is to unite so far as possible the dignity and religious feeling of the earlier painters with an avoidance of the simply archaic features which perplex the English child of the present day ; whilst in the landscape portions a closer fidelity to Oriental scenery has been aimed at than was possible to the mediæval artists.’

We venture to think that the words of this prospectus might with advantage have been couched in a simpler or less ambitious strain. ‘ A rendering of the inner soul . . . of the Life of our Blessed Lord ’ !!! Did the writer really think what he was saying when he penned those words ? We venture to suggest that this circular be withdrawn from circulation. The next paragraph is intended, we suppose, to tell us in a somewhat roundabout way that the chromolithographs are not faithful reproductions of the original pictures. We are sorry to hear it. Why is ‘ the English child ’ not to be ‘ perplexed ’ ? One of the greatest mistakes in the present day is bringing things down to a child’s level, instead of raising the child up. Perplexity quickens a child’s mental activity. Levelling down leaves the mind stagnant. We are sorry to be compelled to speak in this strain of the well-meant efforts of the Society, especially after the praise we so gladly bestowed on the ‘ Illustrated Life of Our Lord ’ issued in 1885 by the same Society. The four prints which have reached us are ‘ The Flight into Egypt,’ ‘ The Entombment,’ ‘ The Blessing of the Children,’ ‘ The Adoration of the Shepherds.’ The chromolithographs, we are told, are ‘ in the finest style ’ by Messrs. Hanhart. We must demur to this statement, for the colours seem to us to be somewhat crude.